

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SECTION 22 TESTIMONY

HON. CHARLES ROSE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1981, the International Trade Commission held hearings in its section 22 investigation on the importation of foreign scrap tobacco and its effect on the U.S. tobacco price support program.

Among those persons testifying at this hearing was North Carolina Governor Jim Hunt. I would like to share with you his comments.

TESTIMONY BY GOVERNOR JIM HUNT—INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION HEARING ON SCRAP TOBACCO

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission: Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today. As Governor of the nation's largest tobacco producing and manufacturing state, I am deeply interested in matters affecting the future of the tobacco industry.

I am here today, at the request of the North Carolina Farm Bureau, to emphasize to you the importance of the tobacco industry—and the tobacco quota and support program—to the people of my state.

In 1979, tobacco provided jobs for 148,000 North Carolinians. That includes 44,000 farmers who depend on tobacco for a livelihood. It includes many small farmers.

In two recent years (1978 and 1980), the gross income from tobacco on North Carolina farms exceeded \$1 billion a year.

In 1978, the latest year for which comprehensive figures are available, North Carolina farmers received gross income of \$1.1 billion from tobacco. That was more than Kansas farmers received for wheat—and Kansas is the number one wheat state.

It was more than Arkansas farmers received for broilers—and Arkansas leads the nation in broiler production.

It was more than Texas farmers received for cotton—even though Texas is number one among the states in cotton production.

North Carolina's tobacco farm income was greater than California farm income for eggs—and California is number one in the nation in egg production.

I grew up on a tobacco and dairy farm near Wilson, which has the largest tobacco market in the world. My thesis for a master's degree in agricultural economics from North Carolina State University was the basis for the acreage-poundage controls for flue-cured tobacco.

Since becoming Governor nearly 4½ years ago, I have actively championed the cause of tobacco, working with the State's delegation in Congress when anti-tobacco forces have tried to eliminate or weaken the quota and price support program.

In 1979 I led the first tobacco trade mission to China in 30 years, taking with me a group of 12 farmers, industrialists and tobacco specialists for several meetings with Chinese trade and tobacco officials.

I have worked for lower tariff rates on U.S. tobacco entering the European community and other areas of the world. At my request a group of farmers went to Europe to talk with tobacco buyers and manufacturers as a follow up to preliminary discussion which I had there.

As you can see, I have a close familiarity with the tobacco program. And I fear that program is endangered today.

The flue-cured tobacco program that we have today has evolved over a period of 48 years, and it is a great success story.

Since 1965 the control program has been based on both acreage allotments and poundage marketing quotas. This means the grower is limited not only as to the acres he can plant but also the pounds he can sell. These are the tightest controls ever applied to a major farm commodity in the United States.

In referendum after referendum, flue-cured growers have voted overwhelmingly to continue their supply control and price support program. Usually the proportion of favorable votes has been between 95 and 98 percent of the total number cast.

Growers have had to make genuine sacrifices in order to keep their program. There have been many times in the past 30 years when they had to accept sharp quota reductions. Just since 1975, the basic flue-cured quota has been reduced by about one-third. A 40-acre allotment in 1975 would have shrunk to only 27 acres in 1981.

It has not been easy over the years for growers to live with these quota cutbacks, but growers know that the cutbacks were essential in order to make the program work. They have also made it work by continuous fine-tuning of various features of the program.

Under the tobacco program, growers have efficiently produced an adequate domestic and export supply of quality leaf. All segments of the industry and all sectors of the economy have benefited from the stability that the program has brought—stability of supply as well as price. Between marketing seasons, on a year-round basis, buying firms have been able to purchase tobacco from the loan inventory held by the Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corporation. In effect, loan stocks have been used as a reserve supply available to the companies whenever needed.

Prices paid to growers for their tobacco have increased over the years, but not excessively so. Year-to-year adjustments in the support price have been based on increases in farmers' costs. Thus, most growers have been able to survive despite the soaring costs of such production items as fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, labor, machinery and others. If the price support formula had not been written so as to help growers meet today's highly inflated costs, how could the medium and smaller growers hope to survive?

No one should conclude, however, that returns to flue-cured tobacco farmers for the resources used have been excessive. That simply is not the case.

Through the North Carolina State University Electronic Farm Records Program and from other sources, data are available showing that return on investment for a

flue-cured tobacco farm in Pitt County, North Carolina, over the past six years has ranged from 5.2 percent in 1975 to an average of 3.7 percent in 1978-80. For the farm owner who received one-fourth share of the crop as rent, profit as percent of tobacco sales price rose from 2.8 percent in 1975 to an all-time high of 13.0 percent in 1978 and then fell to 11.2 percent in 1979 and 4.5 percent in 1980.

These and other data available on the Pitt County farm show that by any standard of measurement used in business today, the profits have not been excessive.

In one respect the tobacco program occupies a unique place in the agricultural history of America. It has been in operation for more than four decades, and its cost to the federal government during that period of time has been very small. In fact, tobacco growers have received less than one percent of the federal funds spent on all types of commodity support programs over the past 50 years—or for that matter during the entire history of the country.

I submit that tobacco growers have reason to be proud of their program and of the part they have played in keeping the program on a sound basis. Despite the fact that all segments of the tobacco industry have been caught up in a "technological tornado" over the past 30 years, tobacco growers have been able to maintain the basic principle of their program—control of supply in return for fair realistic price support—even though structural modifications became necessary from time to time.

In the past few years, however, our tobacco farmers have become worried by the rising tide of imported leaf. According to the North Carolina Farm Bureau, in 1969 imports amounted to 237 million pounds, or only 18 percent of the tobacco used in cigarettes. By 1979, imports accounted for 31 percent (or 478 million pounds) of the tobacco used in cigarette production. The most alarming increases came in the "scrap" category, which increased from 10 million pounds in 1969 to 204 million pounds by 1979.

A number of factors account for the increases in imports.

The smoking and health issue has resulted in low-tar, low-nicotine, filter-tip cigarettes. Manufacturers have been able to increase the use of imported flue-cured leaf of lower quality than domestically produced flue-cured without the smoker being able to recognize the cheaper leaf.

The tobacco companies have a responsibility to their boards of directors and their stockholders to make a profit. They have become truly international companies, and they have encouraged the production of tobacco in many parts of the world.

At the same time, they have increased their exports of manufactured cigarettes from 29.15 billion cigarettes exported in 1970 to 81.99 billion in 1980, an increase of more than 250 percent.

Another factor in the increase of imports has been that United States foreign policy encourages the importation of goods from less developed countries. Many of them have the large supply of labor and limited

supply of land needed for tobacco production.

Foreign countries have subsidized their tobacco exports in order to earn the U.S. dollars they need for international exchange.

The Office of Monopoly in the Republic of Korea, for example, supplies farmers with fertilizer, seeds, chemicals, covers, materials for drying sheds and so on. Growers receive the equivalent of \$1.64 per pound, farm sales weight, and export the tobacco through joint ventures with international leaf dealers to the United States for \$1.44 per pound, processed weight. It is obvious that subsidies are involved.

All of these factors have contributed to the flood of imports.

And Stabilization loan stocks have increased despite repeated reductions in the national marketing quota, voluntary efforts to limit the harvest of lower-quality tobacco and the elimination of price supports on eight grades of lower-quality tobacco.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that, because of increased imports, about 140 million pounds of domestically grown flue-cured tobacco have been diverted into Stabilization loan stocks. This tobacco had an estimated loan value of \$172 million by the end of the 1979 season. The Department estimates that 38 percent of total loan stocks in Stabilization will be under loan because of increased imports.

Recent actual realized losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the funding agency for Stabilization, have been small. For the 10-year period ending September 30, 1980, price support charge-offs have been \$5.8 million, including a \$5.2 million charge-off for fire loss. Gains to the CCC by collateral fees paid by associations have been \$4 million. Thus, the net loss for the most recent 10-year period was \$1.8 million.

Potential losses to the CCC could be substantial in the near future if excessive inventories are sold at prices that do not cover the value of the collateral plus accrued interest and carrying charges. The USDA estimates that there is a high probability of a CCC loss for existing stocks (1975 through 1980 crops) of at least \$96 million over the 1981-85 period. For future crops, including the 1981 crop, losses associated with sales of loan stocks will depend on the level of imports as well as world and U.S. market conditions. Unless the USDA is wrong in its calculations, it is fair to project that actual taxpayer losses because of imports will be at least \$96 million by 1985. Thus, it is clear that the price support program will soon be monetarily damaged by imports.

Under Section 22 of the Agriculture Act, relief is appropriate when imports "render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this chapter . . . or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture."

We believe this is happening, and that is why we are appealing to this commission for help.

Let me conclude by summarizing my concerns this way:

We are talking about a substantial number of people in this nation—an estimated 103,000 full-time jobs in tobacco farming and another 400,000 part-time jobs during the tobacco harvest.

In the main, they make a fairly modest living. Few of them are affluent.

They have worked hard to build an effective system that costs less than other farm marketing systems.

This system is carefully balanced, depending on the cooperation and understanding of the farmers, the warehousemen, the manufacturers, the importers and exporters, the retailers and wholesalers, and local, state and federal governments.

Now, this careful balance is threatened by the high amounts of imports.

The tariff system must protect the farmers in a reasonable way, if they are producing efficiently. The growers need immediate help to deal with the problem of imports. I am here today to ask that they be given all the help possible, as quickly as possible.●

GEN. ERNEST GRAVES LEAVES THE PENTAGON

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I learned recently that Lt. Gen. Ernest Graves, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Security Assistance, and Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, will be retiring from military service at the end of this month.

During 36 years of military service, he established a reputation as a solid soldier, creative scientist, effective negotiator, and efficient innovator. A graduate of West Point, with a doctorate in physics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a stint at the Harvard Business School, General Graves brought unique qualifications to his last and very important and sensitive assignment as Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSSA). In this position, he was responsible for managing and administering the multibillion-dollar security assistance program carried out by the Department of Defense.

General Graves proved a real and reliable asset in his many dealings with Congress. He established himself as a man of the highest integrity. He knew the legislative process well and demonstrated an ability for deft handling of complex legislation. He proved to be an articulate, witty, accurate, and frank congressional witness. He always had a flair for how to handle intricate issues and congressional concerns fairly. He was flexible and firm, but always forthright. You could disagree with General Graves on an issue, but you always had a feeling that he was listening and taking varying points of views into account in any given case.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend General Graves for his excellent handling of the DSAA assignment. He took on a highly difficult assignment at a time when there was perhaps more disagreement than agreement on several aspects of our conventional arms transfer policy. His tireless efforts and acknowledged expertise on the subject matter have made us all a little wiser and have improved the con-

gressional authorization and oversight process. We wish him well in his next career and hope to see him soon again on the Hill, though hopefully not as a lobbyist. General Graves can be proud of his service to the Nation. Congress will miss him.●

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 181

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1981

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, had I been present in Washington on July 21, 1981, I would have cast my vote in support of House Resolution 181, a resolution opposing minimum social security benefit cuts.

The following statement was to be read at the senior citizen rally on July 21, 1981:

I thank you for your presence here in Washington today. Your visit will open the eyes of the nation to the status of senior citizens in this country.

I am sorry that I am unable to be with you in person, but urgent business requires my presence in Philadelphia. However, I am with you in spirit.

When I took office last January, I had two goals: to serve the needs of the people, and to be an effective and compassionate legislator. I believe that Senior Citizens have earned the right to a dignified retirement. You should have economic security. You should have access to the medical services which you need. It is difficult to support yourselves with double-digit inflation and meager social security benefits.

I have opposed the elimination of the minimum benefit and other cuts in social security benefits which were incorporated in the President's budget proposal. I voted against both of the budget resolutions which he endorsed. Unfortunately, I was in the minority. But I have not given up the fight. I support restoration of the minimum social security benefit, and will do all I can to insure that it passes.

I thank you again for taking the time on this hot day to share your views on social security.●

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. EDNA McMASTER

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is news to no one that one of the great problems facing our Nation is crime. The threat of being robbed or beaten has caused many Americans—particularly senior citizens—to stay off our streets, both day and night. Many have resigned themselves to living in fear.

In Sacramento, Calif., we are proud of one woman who has not given up, a

Sacramentan who has fought back against the rising tide of crime in the streets.

I am sure that every Member of this House will join me in paying tribute to a courageous and dedicated senior citizen in my district, Mrs. Edna McMaster, who has organized a highly successful crime prevention program in her neighborhood. Not only has crime been reduced in Mrs. McMaster's area of Sacramento, news reports of her efforts have galvanized the entire community into action against crime.

Mrs. McMaster lives in the Meadowview section of Sacramento, long known for its high rate of burglaries and street robberies. Two and one-half years ago, she was asked by the city police department to hold a neighborhood "home alert" party, to give police officers an opportunity to demonstrate home security and personal safety techniques to area residents.

Thanks to Mrs. McMaster's hard work, that first meeting was an overwhelming success. Through her leadership, Mrs. McMaster's neighborhood is now sticking together in the fight against crime.

Next door neighbors who were previously strangers, despite years of living on the same block, now watch out for each others' homes, property, and personal safety. Mrs. McMaster walks door to door on a regular basis, delivering police brochures and other information, and generally inspiring her neighbors to fight back against crime. As a result, crime has been significantly reduced along Wakefield Way in Sacramento.

Stories about her one-woman crusade against crime presented in the local media have encouraged other neighborhoods in Sacramento to take action. As a result, many are initiating their own home-alert programs through the police department.

I ask the House to join me in commending Mrs. McMaster for her tireless devotion to improving the safety, sense of community, and the quality of life in Sacramento, Calif.

Edna McMaster serves as an inspiring example of how a single individual can make a real difference in the life of a community.●

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO RECOGNIZE THE SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF OUR FOREIGN COMMERCE MERCHANT FLEET BY GRANTING SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for consideration of the Congress a bill which

may make the difference between the United States having a merchant marine or becoming even more reliant on the fleets of other nations. We are all aware of the essential but ever-weakening link in our preparedness program which is the U.S.-flag merchant marine, and there is not a soul among us who does not want to reverse this trend. The investment this country makes in our merchant fleet is paid back many times over in the form of availability for sealift support for our Armed Forces and by providing a stable and reliable ocean transportation system so necessary to this Nation's importers and exporters.

The bill I introduce today would allow carriers who acquire those capital assets necessary to provide transportation services to depreciate or "expense" those costs in years in which they have earnings sufficient to set off their sizable investments. The ocean carrier business is one of relatively low earnings to equity ratios, a condition which inhibits investment in this essential industry. The bill I introduce recognizes the special nature of this industry and without changing any present or proposed tax program grants to the merchant marine the relief necessary.

In addition, we recognize that our maritime subsidies are threatened with phaseout, and that more operators may construct or reconstruct their U.S.-flag vessels in foreign shipyards. To encourage the maintenance of a U.S.-flag fleet, and also to encourage an investment policy which will encourage operators to return to U.S. shipyards to construct vessels, the bill I introduce allows an operator to deposit earnings from a foreign-built U.S.-flag vessel in a capital construction fund, the withdrawal from which would require the construction of those vessels in U.S. shipyards.

At this time, when many seek to end direct public support for private industry, we must assume a responsibility to examine the effects such actions will have on what are, more than ever before, vitally needed industries. This bill examines one such industry and provides encouragement to maintain that industry with a minimum of Government intrusion of public cost. I ask your support.●

ILLEGAL ALIENS AND SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, July 22, 1981, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ILLEGAL ALIENS AND SOCIAL SERVICES

In recent meetings with Hoosiers I have been impressed by how strongly they object to the large number of illegal aliens in the United States. These Hoosiers believe that illegal aliens are taking advantage of costly social services to which they are not entitled, and that they are responsible for budget cutbacks which will mean fewer social services for eligible Americans.

In response to these meetings I have attempted to find out whether the drain on social services caused by these illegal aliens is serious. As is often the case in such matters, strong claims have been made on both sides of the issue. Some observers explain that illegal aliens come here to work, that they are fearful of applying for any public benefits, and that the majority of them are taxpayers in any case. Other observers reject this point of view, arguing instead that illegal aliens are already straining hospitals, schools, and various programs of public assistance in many American cities. It seems that such a controversy ought to be easy to sort out, but it is not. Although information is available, it is not comprehensive enough to permit us to draw definite conclusions.

There is not much doubt that illegal aliens reside in America in great numbers. Steering clear of guesses that run as high as twelve million, the federal government has speculated that the true number is to be found somewhere between 3.5 million and six million. Records give evidence that the population of illegal aliens has been rising steadily for more than a decade. Nearly 1.1 million illegal aliens were located in 1979, more than six times the number located in 1967. There is not much doubt, either, that illegal aliens weaken social services where their concentrations are high. Conversations with some of my colleagues from southern Florida persuade me that the pressure placed on social services by Haitians and Cubans there is very nearly overwhelming. A county in California has sued the federal government for the \$88 million the county has paid to cover the medical expenses of illegal aliens. Texas has denied it has a duty to school the children of illegal aliens. New York City has had to require documentation of citizenship from those who apply for welfare.

Notwithstanding these trends and events, the hard data that would reveal any widespread problem (or the lack of such a problem) are sketchy. A current government report summarizes the little we know about illegal aliens and their relationship to social services. Drawing statistics from interviews involving almost 8,000 illegal aliens, the report suggests that about 57 percent may pay social security taxes and as many as 62 percent may pay income taxes. It also suggests that only 4 percent receive jobless benefits and as few as 2 percent receive welfare.

The most recent presidential commission to study America's immigration policy reinforces the view that illegal aliens do not place a substantial burden on social services. Their use of programs of cash assistance seems to be minimal, and they appear to be straining schools and hospitals only in isolated instances, such as southern Florida.

There are several reasons why illegal aliens may not be as serious a threat to our system of social services as is sometimes thought. The population of illegal aliens is a working-age, predominantly male group whose need for welfare is not great. Illegal aliens often shun contact with public offi-

cial out of fear that they will be discovered. A major point, often overlooked, is that illegal aliens are simply not eligible for most forms of public assistance, so they draw benefits only by fraud or error. The list of federal programs closed to illegal aliens is long. On it are aid to families with dependent children, all the initiatives of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, all other initiatives administered by the Department of Labor, food stamps, legal services, medicaid, all six varieties of student financial aid, supplemental security income, and unemployment compensation. Social security, disability, and medicare benefits are available to all people who have worked the necessary time in covered employment, but illegal aliens have been barred from obtaining social security numbers since 1972 and thus have not been able to qualify for social security benefits. Few illegal aliens who have numbers actually receive benefits.

Even so, the problem of illegal aliens' abusing our system of social services is sufficiently acute that Congress should take steps both to diminish the abuses that exist and to prevent such abuses from becoming more serious in the future. Hoosiers are right to insist that our social services should be available only to Americans and to legal residents who have contributed to the programs. We should demand proof of citizenship or legal residence before benefits can be granted. We should encourage closer cooperation between administrators and law enforcement officials. In addition, we should enact vigorous measures to reduce the number of illegal aliens in our midst. Civil penalties for employers who hire illegal aliens and larger budgets to enforce our immigration laws are just two things we might consider. ●

U.S. TRADE POLICY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, the Export Task Force had the distinct pleasure of meeting with U.S. Trade Representative Bill Brock and Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige to discuss the recently announced trade policy.

As chairman of the task force, I would like to share this white paper on the administration's trade policy which was released by Ambassador Brock on July 8 at a joint hearing of the Senate Finance and Banking Committee. I commend the administration's efforts to focus on this important issue of international trade.

STATEMENT ON U.S. TRADE POLICY

A strong U.S. economy is our goal. Free trade, based on mutually acceptable trading relations, is essential to the pursuit of that goal.

International trade is, and will continue to be, a vital component of the United States' economy. The trade policy of the Reagan Administration will complement domestic economic programs which are designed to increase employment and output and reduce inflation.

One of the principal requirements of a strong U.S. economy is the maintenance of

open markets both at home and abroad. The United States is more dependent on international trade than at any time in recent history. Exports generate higher real income and new jobs, and imports increase consumer choice and competition in a wide range of goods and services.

The United States is increasingly challenged not only by the ability of other countries to produce highly competitive products, but also by the growing intervention in economic affairs on the part of governments in many such countries. We should be prepared to accept the competitive challenge, and strongly oppose trade distorting interventions by government.

We will strongly resist protectionist pressures. Open trade on the basis of mutually agreed upon rules is in our own best economic interests, and is consistent with the Administration's commitment to strengthen the domestic economy.

We will give top priority to international trade. The President's Economic Recovery Program will strengthen industry and agriculture and improve the U.S. competitive position. Internationally, we will pursue policies aimed at the achievement of open trade and the reduction of trade distortions, while adhering to the principle of reciprocity in our trading relations. In seeking these fundamental objectives, we will initially focus on five central policy components. These are:

1. Restoration of strong non-inflationary growth to facilitate adjustment to changing domestic and international market conditions;
2. Reduction of self-imposed export disincentives; and better management of government export promotion programs;
3. Effective enforcement of U.S. trade laws and international agreements;
4. Effective approach to industrial adjustment problems; and
5. Reduction in government barriers to the flow of trade and investment among nations, with strong emphasis upon improvement and extension of international trade rules.

RESTORATION OF STRONG NONINFLATIONARY ECONOMIC GROWTH

Fundamental to any effective trade policy is the implementation of domestic economic programs that increase incentives to invest, raise productivity, and diminish inflation. The Administration's economic recovery plan provides the framework for achieving these objectives. The four component parts of the plan are: Reduction of the rate of growth in government expenditures, reduction of marginal tax rates for individuals coupled with accelerated cost recovery for business, regulatory reform and a consistent and predictable monetary policy. Implementation of the program will improve the competitiveness of U.S. products both at home and abroad.

Recent trends in U.S. productivity and investment have weakened our ability to compete abroad and eroded our industrial base at home. While the U.S. has one of the highest levels of capital per worker and productivity in the world, the U.S. advantage in these areas is rapidly diminishing. A recent survey of 19 industrial countries indicated that the United States now ranked 17th in the rate of productivity growth and 19th in the rate of investment. Other surveys have indicated the United States has had a decline in research and development expenditures, while other developed countries are increasing theirs. The U.S. is losing its technological lead, and this is bound to have se-

rious consequences for the international competitiveness of U.S. products.

The economic recovery program submitted by the Administration can reverse this trend by improving incentives to invest in capital equipment as well as in research and development. Stronger economic growth is also important to facilitate the adjustment to changing international market conditions.

High inflation has also had a strong negative effect on U.S. competitiveness abroad. The Administration's economic recovery plan will reduce the rate of inflation and as a result bring down interest rates, and it will provide the basic economic underpinnings essential to expanding trade opportunities.

REDUCTION OF SELF-IMPOSED EXPORT DISINCENTIVES AND IMPROVEMENT OF U.S. EXPORT PROMOTION PROGRAMS

A high priority will be assigned to the reduction or elimination of domestic export disincentives. Confusing, contradictory and unnecessarily complex laws and regulations adversely affect exports. The recent report to the Congress on Export Promotion Functions and Potential Export Disincentives identified three types of policies as the most significant export disincentives—the taxation of Americans employed abroad, the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and export regulations and controls.

We will act to mitigate the trade-inhibiting effects of regulatory measures without undermining their legitimate objectives. Vice President Bush is chairing the Task Force on Regulatory Relief, which will review both existing regulations and future regulatory proposals.

The Administration will support remedial legislation where it is necessary. In this regard, the Administration supports the basic objectives of the Export Trading Company Bill currently before the Congress. The Administration also supports legislation to change the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, and to reduce the income tax burden on Americans working and residing abroad.

We will make more effective use of the government's export promotion resources. The Department of Commerce is assigning a high priority to strengthening the Foreign Commercial Service and improving domestic export information efforts. Personnel in the Commerce District Offices will be spending more time in the field counseling exporters, holding "how-to-export" seminars, and developing "how-to-export" manuals. The Department of Agriculture will continue to give a high priority to overseas marketing efforts of the Foreign Agricultural Service and to domestic export-support programs.

EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF U.S. TRADE LAWS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

The U.S. and its trading partners have negotiated international agreements to reduce barriers to trade and to establish common ground rules to limit trade-distorting practices. These agreements are predicated on the fact that trade must be a two-way street in a genuinely open trading system. In the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, agreement was reached on new international codes of conduct covering a wide range of nontariff barriers. U.S. trade laws and international dispute settlement procedures provide the means for effective enforcement of these international trade agreements.

The Administration will strictly enforce United States laws and international agreements relating to international trade. Specifically, our antidumping, countervailing

duty, and similar structures are designed to neutralize or eliminate trade distortive practices which injure U.S. industry and agriculture. We regard these laws as essential to maintain the political support for a more open trading system.

We will insist that our trading partners live up to the spirit and the letter of international trade agreements, and that they recognize that trade is a two-way street. Accordingly, we will closely monitor the implementation of international trade agreements by all governments and we will make full use of all available channels for assuring compliance. We will need full and active support from the private sector in identifying compliance problems and in seeking solutions.

The manner in which the MTN codes are applied will determine the shape and effectiveness of the GATT agreements. We will actively pursue the implementation of the codes in a manner consistent with the goal of reducing trade barriers and trade-distorting measures. We will fully utilize the consultation and dispute settlement procedures of the GATT to assure that MTN principles are applied in practice.

One of the most difficult challenges we must face in seeking to achieve free trade is to develop appropriate responses to the growing intervention of foreign governments in international trade. The nontariff agreements negotiated in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations deal with many aspects of such intervention, and full enforcement of these agreements will help deal with this issue. We will seek new ways of dealing with forms of intervention that are not covered by these agreements.

We are currently faced by a growing subsidization of export credits by many of our trading partners. We will seek to renegotiate the existing international rules regarding official export credits. Our objective is both to substantially reduce, if not eliminate, the subsidy element, and to conform credit rates to market rates. The Export-Import Bank will target its export credits and guarantees where they are most needed to assist U.S. exporters facing subsidized foreign competitors.

EFFECTIVE APPROACH TO INDUSTRIAL ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

Developments in the world economy over the past few years, such as the energy crisis and the emergence of new suppliers of manufactured and agricultural products in world markets, have triggered major adjustments in the U.S. economy. Developments in the world economy over the foreseeable future will create the need for continuing adjustment.

Our policies toward the adjustment will take into account the fact that the economic vitality of certain sectors of our domestic economy is clearly essential to national security. Where other nations have a natural competitive advantage, U.S. industry must either find a way of upgrading its own capabilities or shift its resources to other activities. Where the foreign advantage is based upon government subsidies and other trade-distorting practices, U.S. policy will be to enforce U.S. trade laws and to work to eliminate such practices.

The economic program outlined by the Administration will support adjustment by encouraging non-inflationary growth and by removing obstacles to the operation of market forces. The Administration will continue taking measures, including regulatory relief and adjustment assistance, in order to

further adjust in cases where severe problems exist.

Adjustment assistance and safeguard measures can ease problems of dislocation for firms and workers, but they do not of themselves effectuate adjustment. It is U.S. policy to place primary reliance on market forces to facilitate adjustment in affected industries.

Import restrictions, subsidies to domestic industries, and other market distorting measures should be avoided. A better solution to the problems associated with shifts in competitiveness is to promote positive adjustment of economies by permitting market forces to operate. It will be critical to encourage, through international negotiations, all governments to adopt adjustment policies which do not have trade and investment distorting effects.

REDUCTION IN GOVERNMENT BARRIERS TO FREE TRADE

The Multilateral Trade Negotiations achieved agreement on new codes covering a wide range of nontariff barriers and on a substantial reduction in tariffs. There are a number of issues, however, which were not adequately resolved in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations or which were not addressed in these negotiations. It is U.S. policy to deal with individual problems through bilateral negotiating efforts in the short run, and to seek to negotiate new multilateral disciplines over the longer term. Our objective will be to reduce government barriers, both in the U.S. and abroad, to the flow of trade and investment among nations. The preparations for any new initiatives must be thorough and in some cases could be quite lengthy.

CONCLUSION

Adoption and implementation of this comprehensive trade policy approach for the 1980's will strengthen U.S. economic performance and our competitiveness in world markets. To fully succeed in this area, we will need to muster a strong national determination, a will to persevere and prevail, and a commitment to rely on competition and free markets. The government can help create an environment conducive to efficient and profitable production. But it is private individuals and enterprises who have to take the initiative to seize economic opportunities.

Our trade policy is built on the close cooperative relationship with the Congress and the private sector. Our private sector advisory committees have become a fundamental element to our trade policy process. In implementing the agenda we have outlined, we will work closely with each, and increasingly with the 50 state governments in our federal system.

A strong U.S. trade position must be and will be a national priority. It is vital to our domestic well-being; it is essential to our capacity to provide leadership to the free world. ●

THE PRIME CAPTIVE NATIONS IDEA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, after a whole generation of exposure to the "Captive Nations" concept and

Public Law 86-90, many analysts both here and abroad still cling to certain myths and misconceptions beclouding both the law and the concept. If anyone has tried consistently to dispel them, it is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

In an article on "The Prime Captive Nations Idea," prepared for the summer issue of the international journal, the Ukrainian Quarterly, Dr. Dobriansky exposes each of the dominant myths. Because of its length, I include certain main excerpts from the article which I believe my fellow Members will find of profitable interest:

THE PRIME CAPTIVE NATIONS IDEA

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Our foreign policy with regard to Moscow and its global challenge will never be on an accurate and successful course until the very nature of the Soviet Union is fully comprehended and made the fixed, focal point of our manifold operations. At first sight, this observation might appear to be extreme or simplistic, but with some reflection given to its supportive grounds, both conceptual and empirical, its basic validity will be readily perceived.

How often in your life have you heard the expression "Know your enemy"? It suggests you consider his strengths and weaknesses if you seek to advantageously overcome him. Now this is a wise and simple rule of existence with the broadest field of application. Yet, strangely enough, despite the historical record of 61 years of Soviet Russian imperialism and conquests, the majority of our analysts and officials still shy from honestly recognizing Soviet Russia as a committed enemy to our national interests and the Soviet Union, in which the RSFSR is only one republic, as the primary empire of Moscow. Supposedly, the facts that we are in a nuclear age and diplomatic considerations must be observed are sufficient to alter the patently objective realities of history. Needless to say, they cannot.

In dealing with this field, there are far too many who operate with inaccurate concepts that could only contribute to poor policy results. Also, as in the case of human rights policy, one cannot but wonder about the requirement of sound logic. It took me and others almost four years to crank out of the Carter Administration an official admission of the existence of national human rights.

MOSCOW'S ACHILLES HEEL

Despite over 20 years of popular and academic education, it still is not generally understood that the Captive Nations Week Resolution, passed by Congress in July 1959, contains within itself the prime captive nations idea. The resolution was signed by President Eisenhower into Public Law 86-90, and every president since has issued annually a proclamation as called for by the resolution. Alluding to the idea, the foreword in a current congressional publication on the subject points out, "it is not generally known that on documented record since World War II no single, activist idea has produced deeper concern in the Kremlin than the composite captive nations one. From Khrushchev to Suslov to Arbatov fulminations against Public Law 86-90 have been intense, persistent and fearful. Any

thoughtful person would naturally ask "Why?"¹

Indeed, why? The answer lies in the prime idea of this captive nations concept. The Soviet Russians understand it; regrettably, our people don't. And will continue to fumble and waste resources in costly consequence. Pointedly and unmistakably, the resolution taps Moscow's Achilles heel, namely the majority of captive non-Russian nations within the USSR itself. These were the first victims of Soviet Russian imperialism in the 1918-20 period; the resources of these nations have been and are continually exploited for Moscow's aggressions beyond the USSR; these nations have the longest, though still unsuccessful, record of resistance against this last, chief form of imperialism in the contemporary period; and these nations constitute the primary and inner empire of the foreign conqueror, Soviet Russia.

With intensive, detailed research a voluminous catalog of our governing illusions on these two basic points could be readily compiled. Just a few current examples here will serve to make the point. For instance, the widespread, uncritical usage of the term "the Soviets" is far more than just a case of semantic point. Our officials and non-officials wallow in it, yet fail to ask themselves why? Try it on any of them and you'll get the informative answer: everyone else does and isn't the Soviet Union "soviet." Unfortunately, this is the level of the average conception of the Soviet Union, made up of "the Soviets." By this ignorant usage we help Moscow more in its attempts at Russification within the USSR, at conveying the image of Homo Sovieticus, at displaying a unified "nation" of peoples than it can possibly succeed in realizing with its non-Russian captives in its primary empire.

Put concisely, this new empire called the USSR was carved by the conquering Soviet Russians; they dominate and control it; they call the shots directed at our national security and that of the Free World. Why then conceptually blur reality with this ludicrous usage? Aside from the basic Russian/non-Russian division in the USSR, the soviets—councils of workers and peasants—are only rubber-stamp bodies and scarcely influence the policies of Russian-based Moscow. In our American way, call a spade a spade, and act accordingly.

As another example, in a special issue in 1980, Time magazine begins its report this way: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not just a country, but an empire—the largest and probably the last in history."² This is progress and should serve as a hallmark for all of our media, not to mention government. However, no sooner this is said the reader is exposed to the same stereotyped concepts as "gross national product," "100 ethnic groups," "Soviet life" and other inconsistent terms that hardly support a working conception of the USSR as "an empire."

One more example, this time showing an inverse conceptual relationship to the above. The above shows a solid, overall concept but a poor support of it in the management of empirical details. This one is presented with details but fails to place them in an overall concept, which here is the primary Soviet Russian Empire. A long-term

analyst of the USSR writes, "Most of the non-Russians I met protested their subjugation to the 'Russian Empire' far more openly than before. Most were far more eager to boast of anti-Russian feeling—many called it 'fury'—in their native republics."³ Yet, despite what he heard, he writes in the same paragraph, "They are often exceeded by nationalist passion, anti-Russian by its very nature, among the Soviet minorities, from Lithuanians in the west to Kalmyks in the east—and including especially Ukrainians, Estonians, Georgians, Armenians, Uzbeks, and most of the Muslim peoples, whose birthrate is roughly five times the Russian average."

Now, who are "the Soviet minorities"? Is this supposed to mean minorities like our minorities in the USA? Sadly enough, too many of our people cling to this fanciful notion. On an overall quantitative basis the Russians have been in the minority for sometime.

SOVIET RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

A cognitive appreciation of the USSR as a functioning primary empire presupposes some form of imperialist conquest. The historical record is abundantly clear on this. The marauding Russian Red Army under Trotsky was the determining factor in producing the first set of captive nations. As many honest Russian intellectuals, such as Fedotov, Berdyaev and others have long observed, traditional Russian imperialism was again at work, this time under the guise of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Soviet Russian imperialism is the real force, not an outmoded and theoretically irrelevant Marxist-Leninist ideology, that accounted for the recreation of the Russian Empire in the form of the USSR in the early 1920's and for its imperial extensions in the 1940's and beyond.

On this subject we shall hear more about in the period ahead. It's not a new subject the issue was met over a quarter of a century, when the Kerenskys, Nicolaveskis and other Russian emigres and friends attempted to befuddle our public regarding the Soviet Union and the mythical force of communism. This attempt is re-emerging with a new crop of Russian emigres, highlighted in particular by Solzhenitsyn.⁴

A few examples of this part of the equation (Soviet Russian Empire=Soviet Russian Imperialism) are also in order. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has well nigh discredited himself last year with his foolish attack against the Captive Nations Week Resolution. In this he joined Khrushchev and his successors. His discredited status was amplified by the wide chasm of thought as represented in his letter to the Kremlin in 1973, when he still was in the USSR, and his article in Foreign Affairs.⁵ In basic principles and thought the latter contradicts entirely the former.

In line with this trend, another example is the concentrated attack on Dr. Richard Pipes, a renowned Harvard University professor and now with the National Security Agency in the Reagan administration. Solzhenitsyn viciously criticized Professor Pipes in his article, and this assault is continued in a similarly distorting article by a product of Moscow University's history de-

partment. The writer is concerned by asking "Doesn't the Communist ideology have something to do with the shape of Soviet foreign policy?"⁶ And he then devotes his article to the implication that if anyone points to traditional Russian imperialism, now in its Soviet phase, or casts a light on the Soviet Russian Empire rather than stressing communism, he is anti-Russian. In plain logic, one can be anti-Soviet Russian imperialism, anti-Soviet Russian Empire, without being anti-Russian.

This subject of Soviet Russian imperialism as against the myth of communism or Marxist-Leninist ideology should be publicly highlighted. Following the passage of the Captive National Week Resolution, Khrushchev challenged us to discuss it in the United Nations. President Kennedy stated that "any summit meeting with the Russians would have to include discussion of the imperialism of the Soviet Union."⁷ The thought is in the right direction, but how does one account for all the non-Russian nations now held captive in the USSR?

Another interesting aspect of this subject of imperialism is the propaganda mileage realized by the Kremlin in covering up its imperialism and persistently accusing "American imperialism," with impact even within our own country. For the thousandth time among utterances by the Soviet Russian leadership, Brezhnev states in a recent speech before the rubber-stamp Supreme Soviet that "bellicose-minded militaristic circles, headed by American imperialism" are responsible for a new, unprecedented arms race.⁸ Pravda, of course, is replete with accusation. Recently it directed a warning to the 95-nation group of non-aligned nations meeting in India to beware of "subversive activity against the movement by international imperialism and Peking hegemonism."⁹ Defense Minister Dmitri Ustinov sees peace and security being threatened by "imperialism," and Leonid Zamyatin, the international information chief of the CP Central Committee, claims that Poland's Solidarity "is backed by the imperialist forces of the West and operates in contact with subversive centers outside Poland."¹⁰

In these statements note the key words of "imperialism," arms race, and subversive activity. Just turn them about in full application to Moscow and Soviet Russia, and the persistent accuser becomes the fitting accused. The Kremlin's propaganda technique of transferred blame can be easily countered, but the democracies have scarcely developed the counter-propaganda strategy.

Just one more note on this vital subject. It is refreshing to see Galbraith and others discussing "Soviet imperialism." In thinking about imperialism they seem to content themselves with what they construe to be a decline of the Soviet "Empire."¹¹ Facts for

¹Wladislaw G. Krasnow. "Anti-Soviet or Anti-Russian?" Encounter, April, 1980, p. 68.

²Lois Cannon, Lee Lescaze. "Moscow Relations Viewed Grimly," The Washington Post, March 29, 1981.

³"Brezhnev Urges New Round of Arms Talks With the U.S.," The Washington Star, June 24, 1981.

⁴UPI, Moscow, February 8, 1981.

⁵Bruce W. Nelson. "Soviets Liked West to Nazis in 1941." The Washington Star, June 22, 1981.

⁶John Kenneth Galbraith. "20 Years of Decline in the Soviet Empire," The Washington Post, March 17, 1981.

⁷George Feifer. "Russian Disorders," Harpers, New York, February, 1981, p. 51.

⁸See writer's article "Now Afghanistan—And Also Solzhenitsyn," The Ukrainian Quarterly, Summer, 1980, pp. 135-136.

⁹"Misconceptions About Russia Are A Threat to America," Spring, 1980.

¹House Document No. 96-365. Twentieth Observation and Anniversary of Captive Nations Week. USGPO, 1980, p.v.

²"Inside the U.S.S.R." Time, New York, June 23, 1980, p. 22.

the past 20 years, such as the Chinese-Russian rift, the Indonesian massacre of communists, the ouster of Russians from Egypt, the turnabout of Somalia and the like are assembled to prove their point. This isn't the place to argue each of these events. Suffice it to say, that on a scale of over 60 years Soviet Russia's imperial growth overshadows this supposed decline.

THE CNL

On a 60 year-plus scale, the picture of Soviet Russian imperial influence and power looks quite different from what Fritchey, Galbraith and others seek to portray in some short-run span.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS LIST (CNL)—WHO'S NEXT?

[Country, people, and year of Communist domination]

Armenia ¹	1920
Azerbaijan ¹	1920
Byelorussia ¹	1920
Cossackia ¹	1920
Georgia ¹	1920
Idel-Ural ¹	1920
North Caucasia ¹	1920
Ukraine ¹	1920
Far Eastern Republic ¹	1922
Turkistan ¹	1922
Mongolia ¹	1924
Estonia ¹	1940
Latvia ¹	1940
Lithuania ¹	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Yugoslavia (Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, etc.)	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czecho-Slovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960
Cambodia	1975
South Vietnam	1975
Laos	1975
Afghanistan	1980

¹ Countries absorbed into U.S.S.R.

WHO'S NEXT? IRAN, NICARAGUA, EL SALVADOR, NORTH YEMEN, ANGOLA, ETHIOPIA, SAUDI ARABIA, MOZAMBIQUE, REPUBLIC OF CHINA, SOUTH KOREA?

What has pained Moscow and its satraps so about the CNL? Well, the CNL has many utilities. For one, it is solidly grounded in historical fact and scholarship. . . . Had the Russians pursued communism for themselves, there would have been no objective grounds for the CNL ever.¹²

The new crop of Russian emigres should not be allowed to once again becloud the realities of the struggle. As a most perceptive analyst observed almost 30 years ago with reference to another generation of such emigres, "If Russians who claim to be anti-Communists refuse to extend the goal of freedom to non-Russians, then we must wonder whose side such Russians will be on when a showdown comes."¹³

Another utility of the CNL is the implied emphasis it places on the fundamental illegitimacy of the so-called socialist or communist governments. As President Reagan in his first Captive Nations Week proclamation strongly underscores, "governments derive their legitimacy from the consent of the peoples they govern."¹⁴

The CNL serves also the purpose of causing still free people to remember how others fell in the course of 60 and more years under Moscow's armed, determining power. Moscow, and its satraps and products, thrive on people forgetting the realities of history. . . .

THE 23D OBSERVANCE

As a concluding note on this 23d observance, what has been described here as a realistic framework for policy and strategy would not in any way preclude all the necessary things that must be done in inter-state relations to insure peace and also provide the beacon light of national and individual freedom. Negotiations on strategic arms, trade, cultural relations and a competitive coexistence on all levels and in all spheres can be diplomatically and deftly pursued within the framework. In short, the Soviet Russian leadership will get used to our more realistic understanding of it and respect us more for it. As all past empires, this empire overflows with weaknesses and vulnerabilities. ●

CREEPING COMMERCIALISM IN PUBLIC TELEVISION

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, John Weisman, a reporter for TV Guide, has recently written a two-part article on public television's relationship with its corporate supporters. To be certain, corporate contributions have been of inestimable value to the growth of public television, and made possible some of the finest programming available in America. The Reagan administration's proposed budget cuts for public broadcasting, however, will force an ever-greater reliance on corporate largesse, and may eventually lead to the presence of commercials on what was always intended to be a non-commercial medium.

The implications of these developments are profound—especially in the area of programming. The great virtue of public television is that it has the freedom, and the mandate, to pursue the very best in programming, to present what commercial broadcasters either cannot or will not because of their captivity to the ratings race. If public broadcasting is forced to become more like its commercial counterpart because of the funding squeeze, it is important to understand that the danger lies not in which programs will be produced, but in the absence of programs we may never see.

As unrestricted funding, from the Government and public television's viewers, decreases in proportion to corporate support, via grants or commercials, public broadcasting's independence—its ability to create unrestricted programming free from outside influence—may be eroded. It is this issue that must be confronted in tandem with the budget reductions the administration wants to impose on public broadcasting.

Mr. Weisman has presented a comprehensive survey of these developments. Following is the second part of this excellent article, which I commend to my colleagues:

[From TV Guide, June 27, 1981]

BIG OIL AND PUBLIC TELEVISION—HOW CREEPING COMMERCIALISM IS SNEAKING UP ON PUBLIC TV

There was quiet meeting held late last winter at the headquarters of WNET, New York City's public-television station, that could help shape the future of public broadcasting. Present were high-ranking executives of public-television stations, fund-raising experts and other representatives from some of the Nation's biggest and most powerful PTV outlets.

The man who requested the meeting is not a station executive. He is William Cameron, senior vice president for television programming of the giant Needham, Harper and Steers advertising agency. Cameron told TV Guide that he had called the meeting to discuss, among other things, the future of public television in the light of the Reagan Administration's proposed budget cuts; and the proliferation of alternative sources of high-quality cultural programming on cable and pay-cable systems.

Cameron knows about such things because, according to Lawrence Bersohn, manager of advertising services of the Atlantic Richfield Co., a Needham, Harper client, Cameron has conducted informal studies for Arco about where, aside from public television, Arco's money could be spent on programming.

Cameron says he was also seeking a greater role for corporate underwriters in public broadcasting. He said that "there is an enormous opportunity to be able to put our clients in the position that corporate sponsors had 25 or 30 years ago—of control of a show, of tailoring it to your needs."

Such tailoring, Cameron feels, would probably increase corporate giving to PTV.

Cameron's opinions have been repudiated by some of the people he claims he represented. Atlantic Richfield even issued a position paper stating that they have no intention of insinuating their corporate philosophies into any public-television programs they pay for.

But what no one denied is that many major underwriters of public-television programming are beginning to look at new ways to spend the millions of dollars that in the past have produced such shows as *Cosmos*, *Upstairs, Downstairs* or *The Shakespeare Plays*.

For a decade, the Public Broadcasting Service has dominated high-quality cultural television programming. But this is about to change.

CBS Cable, an estimated \$6 million investment in cultural, arts and musical program-

¹² See chapter on "Historical Outlines of Soviet Russian Aggression" in my work *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1967.

¹³ James Burnham, *Containment or Liberation*, New York, 1953, p. 236.

¹⁴ Captive Nations Week, 1981. By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation, July 1, 1981.

ming, is slated to begin servicing more than 2.9 million subscribers on Oct. 12, 1981.

ARTS, a cultural package put together by ABC Video Enterprises and Warner Amex Satellite Entertainment, began service in April.

Bravo, a two-night-per-week cultural cable-TV package, has been in operation since December.

RCTV, headed by former CBS president Arthur Taylor in partnership with RCA, NBC's parent corporation, says it plans sometime in 1982 to begin marketing a cultural service built around BBC programming.

PBS itself has allotted \$350,000 for a study of the feasibility of creating its own pay-cable cultural service, utilizing arts organizations, such as the Metropolitan Opera, currently seen on PBS. Mobil Oil contributed \$125,000 of the study's funding, and Mobil vice president Herbert Schmertz says that one addition to the PBS cable package could be the Mobil Showcase Network series, "shown on a weekly basis."

Chloe Aaron is an independent producer of high-quality cultural programming. Previously, she was PBS's senior vice president for programming and spent some of her time in Great Britain looking at PBS fare made by BBC, Granada, Thames, London Weekend Television and others. Recently back from a scouting trip to London, she reports that things have changed. "It used to be just PBS people over there. Now cable people are taking the same trips. Everybody's bidding, and it's going to drive the price up."

For a number of reasons, these developments are of tremendous interest to the corporations that underwrite public television. All the new organizations producing cultural programming are commercial. This means sponsors can become involved in selecting the subject matter of the projects they fund—and they can advertise on their shows. And, according to many PTV officials, lack of corporate advertising is one of the major reasons that PTV's \$600-million system received less than \$30 million in corporate donations last year.

One hundred and fifteen companies gave underwriting money to public television last year. Of those, 111 donated about 45 per cent—about \$12.8 million. The other 55 per cent, roughly \$15.7 million, came from Exxon, Mobil, Arco and Gulf. This quartet of hugely successful multinational corporations (their combined profits last year were \$8.8 billion more than the gross national products of more than a dozen developing nations), funded wholly or in major part 72 per cent of all the shows telecast during PBS's February 1981 core schedule—public television's equivalent of prime time.

There is nothing inherently wrong with the generosity of Exxon, Mobil, Gulf and Arco, generously that has provided some of the most admired—and most watched—programs on public television. Still, critics charge that these four corporate behemoths wield so much influence over public broadcasting that they have managed to crowd out of the prime-time core schedule any public-affairs programming that might harm their corporate images, while filling the airwaves with hour after hour of ballet, opera, music and drama.

The question that executives at Mobil, Gulf, Arco and Exxon are now asking themselves is whether the investment is getting an adequate return. Until recently, an underwriter's credits were limited to a single line at the beginning and end of each pro-

gram. New regulations permit the use of corporate logos and the identification of the products that underwriters produce. But advertising is forbidden, despite WNET president John Jay Iselin's claim that ads are "inevitable" on PTV. Despite the progress, corporate ad directors such as Arco's Lawrence Bershon say that, dollar for dollar, PTV underwriting is bad business when you count only the CPM—the cost-per-thousand of viewers reached that is the base on which all ad rates are figured.

On the other hand, PTV proponents are quick to say that the alternative forms of cultural programming currently available, even though they accept advertising, don't reach as many people as public television.

Stuart Sucherman, a veteran fund-raiser who has just been hired by four of the Nation's most powerful PTV outlets to help them develop new monetary sources, says that "from a cost-effective point of view, public television is still a pretty good buy." Sucherman argues that public television, in spite of its smaller audience, is watched by more intellectuals and other influential Americans than are the commercial networks.

Even so, ad agencies surveying the possibilities for their corporate clients tell companies like Arco that they cannot be myopic. "They have to take a stand in the cable business," says Needham, Harper's William Cameron.

Exactly what that stand will be is still uncertain. But sources say it is possible that companies such as Exxon, Gulf, Arco and Mobil will be financing their own cable projects.

In the meantime, public broadcasting is not standing still. Three major public-television stations have already formed profit-making subsidiaries, so that they, too, can gain a toehold in the lucrative cable and pay-cable market when it explodes.

Says Public Broadcasting Service president Lawrence K. Grossman, "Nothing's sacred about our role. Things are changing; we will change with them."

Even the concept of public television, as espoused by E. B. White in his introduction to the first Carnegie Commission report in 1967, has evolved. White, an idealist, wrote: "I think [public] television should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay; should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's and our Camelot."

Today, the realists are in charge. "Public television," says KCET president James Loper, "is a misnomer. It's probably the worst thing we could have."

WNET's John Jay Iselin agrees. "I had lunch with someone recently," he says, "who thought that we should not be known as public broadcasters. He told me that we should be called the Independent Broadcasting Service." Iselin, like other executives from major producing stations, thinks that public stations should emphasize the production and distribution of programs on a national scale. Money could be raised from corporations, which would become partners with the producing stations. Thus, it would be possible, for example, for Atlantic Richfield to put up \$3.5 million for the production of KCET's *Cosmos* series—and then receive 50 percent of any profits the series might make in overseas sales, tie-in books, merchandising items and other money-raising ventures.

"What you'd probably have," says one Congressional staffer who has spent years studying the relationship between PTV and big oil, "is the complete selling of public broadcasting as we know it."

Not everyone sees things that way. Mobil Oil's Herbert Schmertz sees new programming possibilities for his firm in PBS's pay-cable venture. He hopes that his company's \$125,000 support will give the idea a shot in the arm. Sources close to Exxon, the world's largest petroleum company, say it also is looking at new ways to product and to fund cultural programming. Indeed, the relationship between PTV and big oil seems to be growing closer than ever.

Part of the problem is that big oil—and other major corporations—seems to be the only direction PTV can turn to as Government funds dwindle. Two Carnegie Commission reports on alternative means to fund public broadcasting have been disregarded, most recently by the Carter Administration, which, despite promises to the contrary, never bothered to address the question of how public television would raise money in the future.

The Reagan Administration has set a new tone for public broadcasting. In a speech to a joint session of Congress, the President said that Americans have had a long history of private support for the arts. And it appears that public broadcasters will have to look there, rather than to the Government, for their future sustenance.

Following the Administration's lead, Rep. Tim Wirth (D-Colo.), chairman of the House Telecommunications Subcommittee, which oversees the authorization bill for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, introduced legislation for a one-year panel that would suggest ways in which public broadcasting could obtain much more outside revenue.

However the problem of PTV funding is solved—and it has eluded solution for more than a decade—the inevitable result of new cultural programming possibilities and new delivery forms will be increased commercialism. Not, perhaps, as crass as much of what you see on ABC, CBS or NBC these days. But the selling of public broadcasting, whether to big oil companies or bigger audiences, means that—to use E.B. White's words—we're going to be getting a lot more Minsky's than we'll be getting Camelot.●

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND SUPPRESSION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for inclusion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two outstanding articles that recently appeared in the Baltimore newspaper, Catholic Review. Both articles describe religious persecution and the suppression of human rights, but in very different parts of the world and under very different governments. In my view, the matter of religious freedom and human rights deserves much more attention today, particularly since the current administration seems

supportive of repressive, rightwing dictatorships, while rejecting a strong human rights policy.

The first article, "Catholic Lithuania—A Forgotten Plight?" was written by an outstanding and highly respected clergyman originally from Baltimore, Father Pugevicius. His article describes the systematic campaign of repression carried out by the Soviet Government against the Catholic Church as an institution in Lithuania, as well as against Lithuanian citizens who attempt to practice Catholicism. The second article, titled "Death Lists, Terror 'Lift' Guatemala's Tyranny Status," by Thomas Kavanagh, delineates the terror and violence perpetrated by the Government of Guatemala against its own people and particularly against the Catholic Church. This is especially significant since President Reagan has lifted a ban on the sale of military equipment to the Guatemalan Government.

I strongly urge my colleagues to read these excellent articles, keeping in mind the foreign policy focus the Reagan administration is espousing and its impact on the most fundamental right—freedom of religion:

CATHOLIC LITHUANIA, A FORGOTTEN PLIGHT?
(By Father Pugevicius)

A Catholic country with no parochial schools, convents, monasteries or press would seem to have its Catholic character slated for extinction.

Add the fact that this country of 3.3 million which is still 65 per cent Catholic has fewer than 700 priests (and those, with a median age of 60) and its single seminary sees an annual enrollment of 22 students, and the hope for a continued Catholic identity diminishes further.

Conclude with a government policy which prohibits members of the clergy to instruct children in the Faith—indeed forbids young people under the age of 18 to participate in the Church, and the life expectancy for the Church in this country is nonexistent.

Yet, the Catholic Church in Soviet-occupied Lithuania has endured these and many more hardships since 1940.

"Despite the obstacles they face," stated Fr. Casimir Pugevicius, a priest of the Baltimore archdiocese currently working as executive director of Lithuanian Catholic Religious Aid in Brooklyn, N.Y., "the people of Lithuania are deeply religious. However, they are waging a life or death struggle against atheism, and look to their brother and sister Catholics for help.

"The problem facing the Church in Lithuania today is not merely a Lithuanian problem, but a Catholic problem," he said.

The Catholics of Lithuania themselves realize the importance of presenting their case to the world. Since 1972, the clandestinely published *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania* has been documenting incidents of harassment, arrests and trials of clergy and laity who cling tenaciously to the Faith.

To date, 46 issues of the *Chronicle* have reached the West.

In the publication, one can read about Nijole Sadunaite, an underground nun sentenced to three years of labor camp and three years of internal exile for disseminating the *Chronicle*. One can be present in the

churchyard of the parish of Betygala, where children were photographed by antagonistic teachers and security agents on their First Communion day.

And, more and more often, one finds the trials—Gemma Stanelyte, sentenced to three years general regimen camp for leading a religious procession . . . Dr. Algirdas Statkevicius, one of the Lithuanian Helsinki Monitors, confined to a psychiatric hospital . . . Vytautas Skuodis, a hydrogeologist known to listen to Vatican Radio, and author of an uncompleted manuscript studying the effects of persecution and atheism on Catholicism in Lithuania, sentenced to seven years strict regimen camp and five years internal exile.

"Unfortunately," said Father Pugevicius, "the plight of the Lithuanian Catholic has failed to excite the imagination and concern of the rest of the Catholic world.

"Certain individuals, like Nijole Sadunaite, have gathered champions across ethnic and religious lines. The support she received, in the form of letters, and the knowledge that groups were continually working on her behalf, told her she was not alone. Although she has only been back in Lithuania since last summer at the conclusion of her sentence, she has already begun signing petitions in support of other prisoners of conscience.

"But the support received by Nijole, and a few other prisoners, is not representative of the attention given to the problem as a whole," he stressed.

And the problems are severe. In a country ecclesiastically divided into two archdioceses, four dioceses and a prelature, there are only two bishops permitted to exercise limited authority. Two other bishops are in exile under severe governmental restriction.

Candidates for the seminary are selected, not by the Church, but by civil authorities, who seek to appoint men of weak moral character willing to undermine the Church. All religious orders have been banned, with those brave individuals who have been clandestinely professed facing almost insurmountable odds in practicing their ministry.

Although freedom of the press is guaranteed by the Soviet constitution, there is no Catholic press allowed. Severely limited editions of a prayerbook, the New Testament, a book of psalms and a catechism were printed since the Soviet occupation, but these are not generally available, and many were exported for propaganda value. No religious articles are allowed to be manufactured.

Parishes are dependent on civil authorities in all things. From required registration of the parish with the local Communist Executive Committee to the actual ownership by the state of sacred Mass vessels, each aspect of religious life and activity is controlled.

Priests may not assist in neighboring parishes, even by hearing confessions. Physicians can, and often do, deny the priest the right to administer the sacraments to a dying Catholic patient in the hospital. The religious education of children is restricted to "spiritual schools"—but the only such school is the lone seminary in Kaunas.

As executive director of Lithuanian Catholic Religious Aid, Father Pugevicius, working with a staff of two, represents the only agency in the free world dedicated completely to assisting Western-rite Catholics in the USSR, spiritually, morally and materially.

In recent years, indications from Lithuania have shown the need to concentrate on getting the message of the "Church of Si-

lence" to the rest of the Catholic world. It is this message that Father Pugevicius feels is not being heard or responded to.

He cited the case of Vytautas Skuodis, sentenced on Dec. 22, 1980, for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

"Vytautas Skuodis should certainly command the attention of every Catholic bishop, priest, layman, as well as the Catholic press and the American public at large," said Father Pugevicius.

"Skuodis was born in Chicago, Ill., on March 21, 1929, and was baptised there. Although his family returned to Lithuania the following year, Mr. Skuodis, also known as Benedict Scott, still claims U.S. citizenship. He even requested an American attorney at his trial last year, but his request was ignored.

The fact that an American citizen is in a Soviet prison camp to serve seven years for writing religious literature and listening to Vatican Radio should have the entire Catholic world in an uproar. But thus far, only one member of Congress, the Hon. Cardiss Collins (7th Congressional District, Chicago), has become involved in the case."

Father Pugevicius expressed hope that the case of Vytautas Skuodis, as well as other specific violations of the rights of believers will find their way to the agendas of diocesan Peace and Justice Commissions throughout the country.

"If more people, especially influential Catholics, began to state their objections to the pattern of violation of human rights, which the Skuodis case and others represent, the Soviet government would think twice before imprisoning believers for activities which are guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution, as well as under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which the Soviet Union signed.

"We're ready to provide all the help and background information necessary to anyone willing to help," the priest stated.

"The Church in Lithuania has survived against tremendous odds," Father Pugevicius pointed out. "For more than 40 years it has struggled, mostly alone, just to survive. This can't continue indefinitely, however. Whole generations of young people are growing up, never having known a free Lithuania, or freedom of thought.

"Without religious materials, even the most ardent believer cannot do alone what entire school systems have been designed to do. The clergy is aging, dying, and are not being replaced. The Church in Lithuania is alive, but severely handicapped . . . it needs the support of all Catholics to survive. A struggle for souls is a struggle none of us can afford to ignore," he declared.

NOTE: Father Pugevicius, former director of communications for the Baltimore archdiocese, is now located at 351 Highland Blvd., Brooklyn, N.Y., 11207. He may be reached at 212-647-2434. Free copies of the *Chronicles* are available by writing to the Lithuanian Catholic Religious Aid at the above address.

DEATH LISTS, TERROR "LIFT" GUATEMALA'S TYRANNY STATUS

(By Thomas M. Kavanagh)

"There is more violence now in Guatemala than in El Salvador. Throughout the country, the body count is running about 30 to 40 per day. It is a state of permanent repression there. Anyone associated with labor unions, the Church—even students—is in jeopardy. . .

"In a nation where 70 per cent of the wealth is owned by two per cent of the population, the government has made it clear there will be no social or economic changes. People here (in the U.S.) seem to think that if you have elections you have democracy. But in Guatemala the military has absolute control. They decide who will be in power. In the last election the two opposition candidates were assassinated."

This is Frank Rafael LaRue speaking. In Baltimore last week to discuss the seldom-noticed turmoil taking place in his native land, the 28-year-old former Guatemalan labor lawyer has been in exile since early this year. Coming to the United States was literally a matter of life or death, he said.

"My name came on the 'death list' two years ago," he explained, noting that this list of people the government considers subversive is actually published in the local newspapers. "It wasn't taken too seriously then but it is now. Everyone whose name was on those lists is either dead or in exile."

"Originally, I decided to stay; that is a big problem there: that so many people must leave . . . But it got to the point where I could not move around freely. I was being followed. In January the secret police went to my relatives looking for me. I went into hiding. I realized there was no sense staying if you couldn't put a foot on the streets."

Mr. LaRue, 28, undoubtedly made a wise decision. According to estimates made by Amnesty International, there have been 5,000 political killings in Guatemala this year alone. Reports from the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States (OAS) have corroborated this figure.

As in El Salvador, the murders are often brutal, the bodies showing signs of vicious torture. As in El Salvador, the victims are often abducted by what the government calls ultra-right wing "death squads" but who Mr. LaRue believes to be members of the military merely dressed in civilian clothing.

As in El Salvador, the violence is carried out against anyone remotely considered "subversive" by the government—including 10 priests and one Protestant minister. As in El Salvador, not one single arrest has followed any of the murders.

Mr. LaRue, whose work just prior to exile had been with the Peace and Justice group in the Guatemala City archdiocese, is now traveling throughout the northeastern U.S. trying to spread the word about the situation in his homeland.

Americans, he said, have been given very little information about the problems there, despite their long-term nature and the fact that media in many other nations—including Canada—took notice long ago.

Some hint of what is happening there hit the American press last week when the Reagan administration bypassed its own guidelines in deciding to sell the Guatemalan government military equipment. President Carter had cut off all aid to that nation in 1977 because of the flagrant human rights violations perpetrated by the government.

In order for aid to be renewed, Congress was to have reviewed Guatemala's record on human rights. The Reagan administration skirted this obstacle, however, by removing the equipment shipped from the list of items covered in the stipulation.

The relationship between the U.S. and Guatemalan governments is apparent, LaRue said: American companies have in-

vested more capital there than in any other Central American nation except Panama (where, of course, exists the Panama Canal). On top of this, oil finds in Guatemala indicate reserves that could eventually supply the United States with as much as 10 per cent of its imported oil. Supporting U.S. interests, i.e., the ruling government, figures to be a Reagan priority, he said.

While the military regime of General Romeo Lucas Garcia claims communist forces are creating an insurrection against his "centrist" government, Mr. LaRue said opposition represents the large number of groups who have lived amid squalor, poverty and now repression for too long.

Noting that Guatemala's mortality, malnutrition and illiteracy rates are the highest in the world save for Haiti, Mr. LaRue said that his nation "is very rich in its resources. It's hard to explain its being so poor when everyone there could live a decent life."

He added that even the Indians—descendants of the Mayan civilization who make up 60 percent of the population—have become part of the "struggle for justice," despite being noted for their peaceful ways. ("The government sees them as passive and naive," said Mr. LaRue).

"This is not a Marxist insurrection but there are Marxists in it," he continued. "Some people struggle because they are Christians, some because they are Indians and all are struggling just to survive . . . but there is definitely no Soviet influence."

Citing one significant difference between the situation in Guatemala and El Salvador, Mr. LaRue noted that military leaders in his homeland are part of the wealthy, ruling class and thus carry out their methods of control more vigorously.

"In El Salvador, the military defends an oligarchy. In Nicaragua, they defended a dictator (General Somoza). But in Guatemala, they are the 'dictator' themselves. The members of the military are part of the broad-based oligarchy so they are not protecting somebody else's wealth but their own. It makes them much more aggressive."

He said the "grassroots Church" has been "very much aligned" with the poor in opposing this aggression but that "the official Church"—in particular Cardinal Casariego—has "remained silent."

An article published in the *Passionist Missions* magazine *Sign*, (February, 1981) pointed out that the Guatemalan bishops "broke that silence (in 1976) when they issued a pastoral letter . . . which was signed by all of them except Cardinal Casariego, archbishop of Guatemala City."

A number of other pleas from the bishops seeking an end to the murder and the system of socio-economic injustices have followed.●

REGENERATION IN THE RUHR

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in January 1949 there was underway in Europe a miraculous adventure. It had to do with the aftermath of World War II and the direction that victor and vanquished might pursue. Would the period be one of retribution, vengeance, and earned guilt-laden remorse;

or could it be something that would bring men in the world together for the mutual benefit of all?

Communist leaders yearned to acquire the Ruhr and its industrial capability for their purposes of world conquest and subservience to their dictatorship.

Luckily for mankind in 1948 the U.S. Congress had enacted the Marshall plan which furnished the nuts and bolts for the revitalization of those who had lost the war and some who were victors. The London Economist called it "the most straightforward, generous thing any country has ever done for others."

Another helpful action in 1948 was when America and Britain called the bluff of the Soviets who threatened to take over Berlin. So there was launched the successful Berlin airlift. Three years later the Schuman plan, a third constructive initiative, helped bind the wounds between Germany and France in a constructive common purpose of recovery and partnership for survival.

Mr. Speaker, there was a fourth element of importance at work in those days. It was the catalyst of Moral Re-Armament which brought about an unlikely spiritual brotherhood among the leadership of France and Germany in politics, in labor, and in management.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Kenaston Twitchell has recently written a book "Regeneration in the Ruhr" (Princeton University Press, 1981) which tells of the dramatic events which saved the Ruhr from being gobbled up by the Communists; but even more importantly Twitchell tells of the spiritual nature of the healing of wounds between France and Germany and between labor and management in industrial Ruhr.

In the late 1920's and early 1930's while I was in college I learned of the work of Frank Buchman, the initiator of Moral Re-Armament, then called the Oxford Movement. In 1949 and the early 1950's I came to know Frank Buchman personally, as well as Ken Twitchell and others active in the movement. I found inspiration in the dedicated lives of these wonderful people who sought to improve the lot of mankind by changing all men and women for the better, stressing as they do absolute honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love.

Twitchell and his family have given much of their lives to the Moral Re-Armament movement, which is alive and well in Europe today; and vigorously growing again in America. Speaking of this movement Twitchell wrote:

It advanced the belief that the basic need of humanity was a new spirit in man himself. Only when men and women change, would nations change. God would lead them

into freedom and truth when they learned to listen and obey.

Mr. Speaker, Twitchell's epilog to "Regeneration in the Ruhr" is worthy of quotation here:

Today, three decades after the events described in these pages, West Germany has a vitality that is outstanding on the continent of Europe. Yet, like America, she risks losing the quality of life and leadership that are vital to the future of freedom.

Can she find that inner commitment that can win over the Communist world, and give humanity a lasting peace?

The Berlin Wall is a stark reminder of the war of ideas that has blanketed this savage century.

Western civilization has incubated over the centuries the secret of regeneration. The crucial question now, for us all, is whether or not we so rejuvenate our Judeo-Christian heritage that we make it the discipline and joy of our lives and the core of our societies.

That choice, above all others, will determine our future. ●

TERRORISM MUST BE CHECKED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, people all over the world were stunned by the attempted assassination of the Pope by a convicted terrorist. Fortunately, this senseless act did not take the life of the Pope and he was able to celebrate his 61st birthday this week. I am sure I speak for all Americans in wishing the Pope a speedy recovery.

We must take a stronger stand against these violent criminals who seek to publicize their causes by harming innocent individuals. On January 5, 1981, I introduced H.R. 67, a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide our country with a more effective defense against the threat of international terrorist activities.

Although I have spoken out frequently against the dangers of terrorism for many years, I often feel that the message is ignored by many with the perception that "it couldn't happen to me."

I recently read an article that may convince those who doubt the very real danger of such violence. The article is entitled "The Nightmare of Terrorism," and it was published in the April 1981 issue of "Association Management," the magazine of the American Society of Association Executives. We are a Nation of many active association groups, and this article brings all too close to home the grave reality of terrorist violence through reports of actual terrorist incidents which threatened the safety of several association conventions.

I submit for the RECORD this article which stresses the importance of recognizing the real possibility of a ter-

rorist incident occurring and the need to implement countermeasures to prevent such a nightmare from becoming a reality.

THE NIGHTMARE OF TERRORISM

(By Margo Vanover)

The threat of terrorism should not deter your association from sponsoring international meetings. But it should make you careful when planning such events.

The warning letter came on September 30, 1980. The bomb exploded about three weeks later.

"Sunday, October 19. The date is engraved on my brain," says Curtis Nabors, president, American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., New York City. That day, a bomb planted in an association convention kit exploded during the opening meeting of the 1980 World Travel Congress in Manila, Philippines. Eighteen people were injured, 11 of whom were ASTA delegates.

The explosive device is said to have been planted by the April 6 Liberation Movement, a political group opposed to the martial law imposed by Philippines' President Ferdinand Marcos. The blast narrowly missed President Marcos and other high-level officials who were attending the convention.

"Fortunately, the explosion did not cause severe injury to anyone. It could have been much more serious," explains Mr. Nabors. "Thank goodness that it wasn't."

Even though terrorist bombings, kidnappings, and murders make newspaper headlines almost daily, few association executives ever stop to think, "It could happen to me." But as terrorist attacks continue to increase, and as more and more associations take their annual meetings and conventions to foreign destinations, international terrorist attacks on association executives become more feasible, more threatening.

"The use of terrorist tactics has increased during the last 12 years—of that, there is no doubt," said Brian M. Jenkins, program director for security and subnational conflict, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, in his recent address to the American Society for Industrial Security. "Although the overall level of terrorist activity oscillates from year to year, the trend is unmistakably upward."

Mr. Jenkins also points to an escalation in deaths during terrorist attacks. "The percentage of incidents with fatalities and multiple fatalities has increased during the last decade. This rise suggests that terrorists are more willing to kill and, perhaps, also more willing to risk being killed."

There were no fatalities in the ASTA attack. But in another terrorist incident that occurred several years ago, and that involved an association, the outcome was not as fortunate.

CONVENTION CHAIRMAN MURDERED

This time the terrorist attack was not international in nature, although it did occur outside of the continental United States. Thomas J. Rouland, CAE, executive director of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, remembers it well.

"Our 1977 Puerto Rico convention was going to be the biggest and best ever. We expected a larger turnout than ever before. . . . The Thursday before the convention, Alan Randall walked out of his home in San Juan, Puerto Rico, to get into his car and was assassinated. . . . No threats were given. Nothing. We had no indication whatsoever."

Mr. Randall was a labor lawyer who had lived and worked in Puerto Rico for a number of years. At the time of his assassination, he was the FBA's convention chairman and a member of its national executive committee.

Later that September day, a note was found in Mr. Randall's briefcase. The note, explains Mr. Rouland, accused the FBA convention chairman of being an enemy of the people. "It said that he had been accused, tried, and executed for being an enemy of the working class," Mr. Rouland recalls.

Ironically, a two-day seminar on terrorism as it affects lawyers was slated for the FBA's upcoming convention. Recognized experts on terrorism from various government agencies were to address the session. In the death note, the Labor Commandos—as they were called by the press—referred to the seminar on terrorism and mentioned by name each of the scheduled speakers.

The convention was only three days away, and some of the convention delegates, already were beginning to arrive in Puerto Rico. The executive committee of the Federal Bar Association was forced to make a difficult, almost no-win decision. Should they cancel? Should they go on, full speed ahead, with the show?

WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

If you are ever faced with a similar decision, the first thing you must do is calmly and methodically begin to obtain every available fact about the situation, says Mr. Rouland. You must also seek the advice of local police officials and carefully weigh their assessment of the situation.

"You must trust the security people," he says. "they know what they are doing. They have to level with us, and we have to level with them. But, in the end, we must look out for the best interests and well-being of our members. As association executives, that's our priority."

The FBA executive committee voted to cancel the convention in Puerto Rico and hold an abbreviated meeting at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington several weeks later. Time was a critical factor in their decision since, according to the association's bylaws, the annual meeting had to be held in the month of September.

Then, in a show of confidence, the FBA rescheduled the convention in Puerto Rico two months later.

Why? In part to satisfy the desire of the Puerto Rico chapter of the FBA, which, though distressed by the death of a fellow member, did not want the original show to be cancelled. "They believed the governor of Puerto Rico would provide adequate security," Mr. Rouland says.

When asked if he had any reservations about returning to the site so soon, Mr. Rouland responded: "No. I felt it was the right thing to do. . . . The terrorists didn't direct their assassination against the Federal Bar Association. They didn't like Alan Randall. It wasn't an attack of us."

Although this murder occurred almost four years ago, it is not and probably never will be forgotten. Soon after the assassination, the FBA established the Alan Randall Memorial Fund, and each year at the annual convention, the Puerto Rico chapter raises money for a scholarship to be awarded to a promising law student.

"This is very important to the chapter—to educate future lawyers in his memory," says Mr. Rouland, "so that Alan Randall will not be forgotten and so he didn't die meaninglessly."

INNOCENT VICTIMS

The purpose of a terrorist attack quite often is not to harm the actual target of the attack but to gain publicity for a cause, to make a statement to the world. And, in the process, innocent bystanders who happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time are victimized.

This was the case in the attack on the travel agents association. The April 6 Liberation Movement did not have a personal vendetta against the American Society of Travel Agents, Inc. "The terrorists were just looking for a forum," explains a state department spokesman. "And they found one."

The truth is that the Philippines had been the site of numerous terrorist attacks prior to the ASTA convention. From late August 1980 until the convention in October, one person had been killed and 40 injured in five bombings.

The association was not the ultimate target. It was the means to achieve an end.

Why, you might ask, did ASTA go ahead with its convention after receiving a warning letter? That's difficult question. In such a situation, there are no right answers. They all appear to be wrong.

AFTER THE WARNING

When Curtis Nabors received the warning letter on September 30, he did not treat it lightly and shrug it off. It and five other copies of the same letter that were later received by ASTA members were handed over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, The Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of State, the U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines, and the U.S. Attorney General. According to Mr. Nabors, the State Department's verdict was that a travel advisory prohibiting travel to the Philippines was not necessary in this instance.

The association did not stop there. A few of the other safety precautions taken by the ASTA included:

Sending telegrams to all of the people who had registered for the meeting, explaining what had happened and what was being done.

A personal visit to the Philippines two weeks prior to the show by Mr. Nabors for the purpose of reviewing the situation with President Marcos and other government officials. "I was satisfied that they had taken every precaution they could," he says.

Extra security at the convention.

Development of a contingency plan that included a proposal for an emergency evacuation, locations of nearby hospitals, instant communication methods, and other information necessary in the event of an explosion.

When asked what his first reaction was at the instant of the blast, Mr. Nabors replies: "To ensure that there was no panic. My second reaction was to determine the extent of the injuries sustained and to evacuate in an orderly fashion. At that point, we didn't know if there was one bomb or 10 bombs. The evacuation worked because the delegates acted very professionally."

THE AFTEREFFECT

Because the association had developed a carefully executed contingency plan, it was able to proceed with at least some of the meeting. Although the general meeting sessions were canceled, the educational programs were aired on government television for six hours on Monday and Tuesday, and some of the social functions went uninterrupted.

Praising the attitude of those in attendance, Mr. Nabors says, "Everyone had a

kind of show-must-go-on type of attitude." He says that, contrary to many newspaper reports, widespread pandemonium did not break out, the delegates were not hysterical, and people did not swarm to the airport to board the next flight out.

He seems to think that, in a way, it may have helped to solidify the association and "pull it even closer together." One example of this is that the ASTA offered a 50 percent refund to all who attended the congress, but so far, he says, only one out of every six people has accepted the offer.

The results of a random survey of 234 delegates conducted by International Research Associates, Ltd., Hong Kong, after the incident, parallels Mr. Nabors' perception of the crowd as calm and orderly. According to the survey results:

Of the respondents who were at the scene of the bombing, only 30 percent said the incident upset or frightened them.

91 percent said they would recommend the Philippines as a vacation spot, and about 80 percent said they would suggest it as a convention center.

65.5 percent of the ASTA delegates polled left the Philippines favorably impressed with the convention facilities, the country's vacation potential, and the friendliness of the Filipino people.

70 percent didn't think the conference should have been canceled because of the bombing.

HOW TO AVOID TERRORISM

These two incidents indicate the potential threat of terrorism to associations and their meetings. How can you guarantee that your association will never become the victim of a terrorist attack?

You can't. There are no guarantees, only reasonable precautions that lessen the chance of an attack, explains Hugh M. Walton, program manager, Commerce Working Group on Terrorism, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Here are a few precautions you should consider:

1. Acknowledge the reality of terrorism and consider that a terrorist incident could someday affect your association. Although this might seem like an unnecessary scare tactic, being aware of the threat is essential, points out the brochure, "Sabotage—Bombs—Bomb Threats," published by the American Society for Industrial Security, Washington.

"Since daily newspapers throughout the world are a continuing chronicle of current activity, a formal program to make management and employees aware of the threat posed by the terrorist would seem unnecessary," the brochure says. "Unfortunately, some managers persistently hold the opinion that, 'It won't happen to us.'"

"The challenge then, is to convince management not only that attacks can happen to them, but that over a period of time, attacks will probably happen to them. Terrorism countermeasures require more lead time to institute effectively than any other security program because of the scope of the threat and the diversity of targets at which a threat may be aimed. No preventive program is effective on a reaction basis, and a suitable response can seldom be developed in the midst of crisis."

2. Select the site of a foreign meeting carefully. Look not only at the availability of hotels, appeal of the city, and size of the convention hall; look also at the incidents of terrorism. Call the Commerce Working Group on Terrorism and other appropriate authorities to find out the number of previ-

ous terrorist attacks, know terrorist groups active in the country, and, most importantly, the capability of the host government to help you with security.

Hugh Walton, of the Commerce Working Group on Terrorism, says that some governments have so many political problems that they cannot protect their own people, let alone a visiting group. A spokesman for the State Department rightly points out that once you are in a foreign country, the ability of U.S. officials to help you is limited. "Our role must be constrained if we're operating outside the U.S. We can't infringe on the foreign country's sovereignty," the spokesman says.

3. Become familiar with the U.S. policy on terrorism, for instance, you should know that it is this country's policy not to accede to terrorist demands. Although U.S. officials will not prevent you from paying a ransom in a case of kidnapping, they do not encourage it and will not act as your middleman, says a State Department spokesman.

"Gist," a reference aid published by the bureau of public affairs, Department of State, summarizes the U.S. policy on terrorism as follows: "The U.S. Government has made clear that it will make no concessions to terrorist blackmail. We will not pay ransom or release prisoners. We support other governments that take a similar stance."

"When Americans are abducted, we look to the host government to exercise its responsibility under international law to protect all persons within its territory. We maintain close and continuous contact with the host government during an incident, providing whatever support and assistance we can."

4. If you are sponsoring a meeting in a country that has been troubled by terrorism, consider keeping publicity to a minimum—especially press releases that would be picked up by the host country's media. "Terrorism is an international threat which requires some advance knowledge about the victim (or association), the itinerary, and the location," reads the American Society for Industrial Security's booklet, "Reducing the Risks of Terrorism."

"Unless absolutely necessary, restrict advance announcement of travel plans and withhold information about company affiliations and titles when registering in an overseas hotel," warns the booklet.

Mr. Walton of the Commerce Department agrees, advising association executives to do without "a lot of publicity and fanfare . . . or you're just inviting trouble."

5. If you have any idea that you will run into problems, develop a comprehensive contingency plan. When a bomb explodes, or a member is murdered, or a board member is kidnapped, you probably will be so stunned that ordinary thinking will be difficult. A contingency plan will alleviate some of your decision making and help you and your members cope with the event.

6. Contact the American embassy before your meeting and once you arrive in the host country. Embassy officials can be a valuable source of information for you. (For specific details on information provided by American embassies, see the accompanying box.)

7. If the host country has a record of terrorist incidents, consider hiring extra security for your meeting. That doesn't mean, of course, that you need guards armed with machine guns standing at every doorway, or that meeting participants need be intimidated by obvious security measures. "You can

take precautionary measures without building a fortress," Mr. Walton emphasizes.

When you are hiring security guards, "Don't take pot luck," Mr. Walton cautions. Instead, he says, find out what major U.S. corporations have offices in the country of your meeting; then call the company's U.S. headquarters and ask the security department what firms they have used. He says that businesses quite frequently trade names of good security firms. "Even competitors are sharing security information with each other to protect American life," Mr. Walton adds.

NOT A DETERRENT

When Curtis Nabors asked if the terrorist blast in the Philippines would deter the American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., from holding additional foreign meetings, his response was negative. "We're an association of travel agents. For us not to travel worldwide, when we are sending clients around the world, would put us in a ridiculous situation."

He also says that, personally, he would go back to the Philippines tomorrow without fear, and "I am not a foolhardy type of person." In fact, he is highly complimentary of the Filipinos, the country, and the convention facilities, saying that the government "did everything it could, before and after the event."

Mario Payawal, tourism attache for the Philippines Consulate, Los Angeles, says he has received numerous letters that express similar sentiments from the ASTA delegates who were at the convention.

"It was just an isolated case," Mr. Payawal explains. "The Philippine government condemns all forms of terrorism." He says that the people responsible for the ASTA bombing are now in custody and "proper charges will be filed against them."

Thomas Rouland is just as complimentary of Puerto Rico as a convention site. He says that after the assassination several people came up to him and said, "Oh, Puerto Rico. I would never have a meeting there."

"You miss the point," was his standard reply. "It's not Puerto Rico." He says that a terrorist incident could just as likely have occurred in New York City, Chicago, or Washington, D.C.

Pedro deAldrey, executive director, Tourism Company of the Government of Puerto Rico, San Juan, agrees. "It is probably safer here than in many places on the mainland. This is a relatively peaceful place to live and visit. . . . We are facing the same problems that are being faced throughout the industrialized world."

The threat of terrorism should not deter your association from sponsoring a foreign meeting—especially with the recent passage of bill H.R. 5973 allowing tax deductions for attendance at foreign meetings. This makes international meetings more attractive than ever before, and your members should not be kept from attending.

But the threat of terrorism should make you cautious and careful. Take adequate precautions, says Hugh Walton, to "make your organization a hard target, rather than an invitation to a terrorist group."●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A PENSION FOR OUR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance has just completed its hearings on H.R. 1918, a World War I pension bill.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation, because I believe that our Nation should finally recognize the dedicated service of these men who fought so bravely during the First World War. Following is a copy of the testimony which I submitted to the subcommittee in support of the early passage of this bill.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LEHMAN ON H.R. 1918

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for H.R. 1918, legislation to give a service pension of up to \$150 per month to our World War I veterans.

During the 95th Congress, this subcommittee held hearings on a similar World War I pension bill, and at that time I also submitted testimony in support of its passage. Unfortunately, during the 95th Congress and again during the 96th Congress, this legislation so desperately needed by our World War I veterans failed to be enacted into law. I will once again repeat the reasons why I am in favor of a bill to help our neglected World War I veterans, and hope that during this Congress it will at last be signed into law.

Our World War I veterans failed to receive the same benefits and consideration that our Nation has consistently given to other veterans. When these veterans were discharged they were not given any job preference classifications or other assistance to enable them to more easily find a job. These veterans did not even receive educational benefits to allow them to continue their education or to learn a new skill so that they could better make the difficult transition to civilian life.

Our World War I veterans did not have the opportunity to participate in any GI home loan programs to assist them in finding affordable housing for themselves and their families. These veterans did not receive hospital care, because veterans hospitals like those of today did not exist. The social security system did not aid most World War I veterans, as they were already too old to build up maximum benefits when it was created in 1935.

Passage of H.R. 1918 is long overdue, and it would serve to at least partially compensate our elderly veterans who were not eligible for the wide range of benefits available to our veterans from later wars. The sacrifices made by our World War I veterans were certainly not any less, and therefore the recognition of their contributions should not be any less.

There are so few World War I veterans that I am hopeful the 97th Congress will pass H.R. 1918 so that our Nation can finally say thank you to these brave and deserving men.

Inflation has imposed a special burden on our elderly who are living on fixed incomes,

and passage of this bill would help our World War I veterans to better take care of themselves and their families. We cannot let any more congresses pass without first assisting these worthy veterans.●

EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT BY PRESIDENT REAGAN

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Reagan's nomination of Arthur Hummel, Jr., as Ambassador to China. Mr. Hummel is a career Foreign Service officer who speaks fluent Chinese. He was born in China, has studied and taught in Peking and even spent a year during World War II fighting against the Japanese with a group of Chinese guerrillas.

I cannot think of a better way to show the Chinese that we are truly interested in talking to them, and in listening to what they have to say, than by appointing an Ambassador who speaks their language. Too often, our representatives overseas cannot speak the language of the country they are stationed in. Too often, foreign leaders are given the impression that nobody in the American Government cares enough about their country to learn their language. I hope this excellent appointment is a sign that we are finally recognizing the importance of foreign language skills in our diplomatic corps and that we are starting to bridge the language gap.●

NEW YORK ASSEMBLY OPPOSES DOMESTIC SWEATSHOPS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, over 140 Members of the House of Representatives, the State Legislature of California, and the City Council of Los Angeles have joined in urging Secretary of Labor Raymond Donovan to abandon his proposal to eliminate the prohibition on industrial homework in the garment industry.

Today, I want to introduce into the RECORD a resolution recently passed by the New York State Assembly which also calls upon Secretary Donovan to abandon this ill-advised plan. Like others in the garment industry—manufacturers, workers, contractors, and regulators—the assembly has recognized that elimination of the restriction would make enforcement of fair labor standards impossible, and would severely undermine the legitimate

manufacturer and States with such restrictions.

The comment period on the Secretary's plan has now closed. The overwhelming percentage of comments, like the testimony of every witness who testified before two hearings by the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, opposed lifting the ban.

I again call for joint action by the Congress and the administration to accept the Secretary's challenge to enact tougher penalties for violators of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Those tougher penalties, however, will be effective only if we retain the ability to enforce the law in the first place. The homework ban, which prevents the proliferation of sweatshops, is an essential part of the effort to eradicate unsafe workplaces and unconscionably poor working conditions.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas approximately forty years ago, the Wage and Hour Administration, concerned about enforcing the minimum wage and maximum hour and child labor standards, provided for in the Fair Labor Standards Act, researched and concluded that there were seven industries in which it was impossible to enforce these standards under industrial homework conditions, and as a result homework was banned in the following industries: jewelry, gloves and mittens, knitted outerwear, women's apparel, buttons and buckles, handkerchiefs and embroidery; and

Whereas, Secretary of Labor Raymond J. Donovan has now proposed to repeal Part 530 of Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, thereby abolishing these much needed regulations covering industrial homework; and

Whereas New York State has more extensive regulations specifying the conditions under which homework will and will not be permitted; and

Whereas a system of state by state regulation of industrial homework would cause a competitive disadvantage to those states such as New York which are more concerned about guarding against abuses in the areas of child labor, pay below minimum wage and poor health and safety conditions; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body hereby respectfully memorializes United States Labor Secretary Raymond J. Donovan to withdraw his proposed repeal of federal industrial homework regulations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the Honorable Raymond J. Donovan, United States Secretary of Labor and each Member of Congress from the State of New York.●

SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EDUCATION IN NSF BUDGET

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House, in its action on the National Science Foundation's appropriation,

spoke out clearly on the importance of continuing the Foundation's programs in research and in science and engineering education. By a strong vote, the House upheld the position of the Appropriations Committee to restore \$70 million in NSF's budget, \$25.1 million of which is added for science and engineering education.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a letter I received from Dr. Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences. His letter, and resolutions adopted by the Academy, articulate the value of the National Science Foundation's role in maintaining a strong base of education in science and engineering in this country, and the Academy's concern lest this role be lost.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1981.

HON. DON FUQUA,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FUQUA: The direction of Congressional action on the proposed 1981 National Science Foundation budget for science education programs in recent weeks has been heartening to those who are most aware of the importance of a strong base of education in science and engineering to this country and who were dismayed by the cuts proposed in President Reagan's earlier budget proposal. There is still reason to be concerned, however, and I am writing to ask that the Congress give careful attention to this part of the NSF budget in taking final action.

As you know, the 1981 level for these programs, which include research fellowships as well as science course-content improvement projects and other programs to strengthen education, was \$85.7 million, reduced to \$67.6 million for the current year. The 1982 budget proposed by President Reagan was \$9.9 million, which the Congress has increased to \$35 million (House version) and \$20 million (Senate version). The intent of the Congress to maintain a reasonable level of effort in this area, to the extent possible under the general retrenchment in the federal budget, is manifest; one must hope it will prevail.

It seems very important that the catalytic, supportive, and quality-setting role of the federal government in education in science and engineering not be lost. Not only the numbers and competency of our future scientists and engineers, but the public's understanding of the complex scientific and technological issues before our society depend on the nation's educational strength. In turn, the adequacy of these resources will determine how successful we are in national programs such as those for a stronger economy, national defense, and a more secure energy future.

About 8 months ago, a report by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education, entitled "Science and Engineering Education for the 1980's and Beyond," presented evidence that our nation has reason to be concerned about deterioration in science and engineering education. The problems are pervasive and complex and will require determined and concerted effort by all sectors of society for their solution. The Federal Government must assume its fair share of the burden by enabling the Federal agencies with experi-

ence in science education—especially the National Science Foundation—to continue educational programs that prove to be effective.

At its annual meeting on April 28, 1981, the National Academy of Sciences passed a resolution expressing its concern about the selective cuts then under consideration for the National Science Foundation budget for science education programs. More recently, our Commission on Human Resources, at its meeting of June 12, reviewed this matter and passed a resolution affirming its support of continued federal efforts to strengthen science education at all levels, not overlooking research fellowships. I am enclosing copies of the two resolutions.

I thought you would like to know about these views. A retreat by the Federal Government at this time from its modest investment in this area would, in my opinion, be most unwise. I hope the Congress will look closely at the NSF education budget in taking final action and will maintain a strong federal emphasis on science education.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK PRESS, President.

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the future of this country depends, in good measure, on its scientific and technological competence, and

Whereas, the future will depend on the scientific education of our young people, the National Academy of Sciences looks with disfavor on the selective cuts in the proposed NSF budget for its scientific education program and hopes that these funds will be restored, or that a reprogramming of the NSF budget will insure the continuance of its science education program.

Passed on April 28, 1981, during the 118th annual meeting of the National Academy of Sciences.

RESOLUTION

The Commission on Human Resources notes with pleasure and concurs with the resolution of the National Academy of Sciences dated April 28, 1981, regarding funding of science education. We believe strongly that there is a national need for substantial and consistent Federal support of all aspects of science education, including research fellowships. We wish to register our serious concern at the recent acceleration of the continuing decline in the availability of competitive open research fellowships for American scientists in the fields coming under the purview of the National Science Foundation. An integrated approach toward the support of these fellowships is needed; this may lead to new forms of support.

Immediate attention should be focussed on this problem to ensure that independent fellowships do not fall through the cracks. The Commission on Human Resources urges the Council and Officers of the National Academy of Sciences to take actions to serve the national need by instilling new vigor and substance in all science education, including research fellowships. We stand ready to help.

Approved by the Commission on Human Resources, National Research Council, June 12, 1981.●

A SOUR DEAL ON SUGAR

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the recent backroom bartering by the administration for votes on their version of the budget reconciliation package could saddle the consumer with an \$8 billion tab. Unless the sugar support program is eliminated from the Food and Agriculture Act of 1981, Americans will end up paying more for every kind of processed food, from cookies to cornflakes.

As we get closer to the date when the House will have the opportunity to consider and vote on the 1981 farm bill, more newspapers weigh in with an editorial against the sugar provision.

A recent editorial column in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Sugar Prices and the U.S., How Sweet It Is," concludes that while the sugar lobby clamors for ever-increasing support from the Federal Government, close examination shows that an intricate system of duties, tariffs, import fees, and quotas exist to protect their interest. Feeding the sugar lobby's collective sweet tooth will undoubtedly cause massive cavities in a person's household budget.

Today, I offer to my colleagues' attention a lead editorial from another one of our Nation's major newspapers, the Chicago Tribune, which finds the sugar provision to be "an inflationary assault on the consumer's pocketbook." I trust my colleagues will follow the advice of the Chicago Tribune and vote down the sugar provision.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 9, 1981]

A SOUR DEAL ON SUGAR

In its eagerness to get its budget passed by the House, the White House made unfortunate concessions to conservative Democrats. Four Louisiana Democrats, for example, voted with the President only after he promised not to oppose higher price supports for sugar, which is important to that state's economy. Well, a commitment is a commitment, and this one was probably worth it to get the budget cut. But the President's commitment does not commit Congress, and the sugar bill is an inflationary assault on the consumer's pocketbook which Congress should vote down even without White House encouragement.

Domestic sugar growers and processors want the federal government to hold sugar prices up. This, they say, will prevent instability in the sugar market. Their definition of an unstable market is one in which sugar growers and processors aren't making enough money to keep them happy. When sugar prices were soaring last year, we didn't hear the industry lobbying Congress to stabilize them downward. Right now, however, prices are low—about 18 cents per pound, or less than half the level last year. All of a sudden instability is a problem.

The administration is quick to point out that raising the sugar support price would

not directly inflate the federal budget. Under the farm bills approved by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees a farmer growing sugar would be able to get a loan from the Agriculture Department at 19.6 cents per pound. If the market price rises to a satisfactory level, he sells his crop and repays the loan; if not, he keeps the loan and lets the government keep the crop. As long as the market price stays well above the support price, farmers will prefer to sell, which means the government will lose no money.

Consumers, however, will lose. To hold the price up and thus minimize its own outlays, the government will probably have to use tariffs or quotas to keep U.S. producers from being undercut by imported sugar. Each penny added to the price of raw sugar costs consumers about \$300 million.

Sugar growers say the market price would have to be at least 22 cents to induce farmers to sell on the market rather than let the government keep the sugar at 19.6 cents. That's about 4 cents above the current price, which translates into a \$1.2 billion bill to consumers. Opponents of the legislation say the price would have to be at least 25 cents per pound, which would raise costs by more than \$2 billion. Either way it's a bad deal. If the market price falls below what farmers need to make it profitable to sell, then consumers would lose less, but the government would have to cover a lot of defaulted loans.

No one doubts that the low prices are squeezing many sugar producers. But that is part of the normal cycle of sugar prices. Producers get rich when prices rise and suffer when they drop. In the long run, things even out for most producers. The growers and processors who can't make up their losses in the good years are those whose costs are too high, and who should be producing something else.

Sugar producers think the government should preserve their right to make money in good times and guarantee them a reasonable income in bad. But as the steel and shoe industries have shown, firms protected from competition soon lose the ability to serve their customers or to make money.●

IN HONOR OF JAYNE MUIR ZBOROWSKY

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, it is with combined respect and pride that I am pleased to cosponsor a reception at the Women's City Club, Cleveland, Ohio, honoring Jayne Muir Zborowsky for her recent appointment as deputy director of economic development for Cuyahoga County.

Jayne Zborowsky has been a longtime personal friend to me and an equally loyal ally to the Greater Cleveland community. Her appointment as deputy director for economic development is but another example of her aptitude for success.

For the past two decades, Jayne Zborowsky has ably served the people in our community as a counselor in the Family Service Association, a child

therapist for the Children's Aid Society, a city councilwoman, a professor and administrator at Cleveland State University, and currently serves as president of the Cuyahoga Women's Political Caucus.

Her untiring efforts in service-oriented occupations targeted at bettering the lot of hundreds of people deserves praise and applause. There is no question that her seasoned art of listening and advising, underlined with a sincere sense of caring, has provided the passport to progress for all those with whom she comes into contact.

Each of us honoring Jayne Muir Zborowsky here today has every confidence that she shall approach her new appointment with the same grace and integrity and vision that she has exercised in her past endeavors. Cuyahoga County is proud and fortunate to have such a woman, to have such a leader. We extend to her every good wish in her new venture and look toward her future and ours with great expectations.●

REAGAN TAX CUT PROMISES DISASTER

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, supply-side economics was once called voodoo economics by GEORGE BUSH, who now supports the concept as Vice President of the United States; yet the wisdom of his original position keeps returning to us.

As columnist Sylvia Porter points out, the Reagan tax cut is almost certain to increase—not reduce—the annual Federal budget deficits. To widen the deficit is to risk the sobering experience of Great Britain, where riots have followed high interest rates, high unemployment, and negative industrial growth. And though Ms. Porter does not mention it, I must observe that the President's plan to boost defense spending by \$1.635 trillion over 5 years will also help to doom his goal of a balanced budget, controlled inflation, and a resurgent economy.

I do not share all of Ms. Porter's assumptions. Yet she has written an insightful column on our Nation's financial prospects that I commend to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Daily News, July 15, 1981]

DEFICITS WILL DOOM SUPPLY-SIDE PLAN

(By Sylvia Porter)

Unless the United States under this administration and this Congress gains, and then fights relentlessly to retain, control over our horrendous federal budget deficits, President Reagan's noble experiment with supply-side economics will fail.

And its failure will drag us all down with it.

Every other part of this economic policy, which has dominated U.S. domestic policy-making since Reagan took office, may be put properly in place (quite an assumption of its own, but let's assume it).

This means our destructively steep tax rates on investment would be reduced to encourage business to take more risks on building new plants and equipment and thereby to spur our productivity. It means our taxes on earnings would be so revised that they would discourage devil-may-care spending by us, as individuals, on things and non-things of temporary value. It means the growth in our money supply would be curtailed to force cutbacks in extension of credit for wasteful projects.

Even nature would get on our side by turning out huge crops and thriving cattle herds to curb food price increases. And geopolitics would throw a couple of aces our way by producing oil surpluses.

None of it would be enough to give supply-side economics a chance to work and send us into another era of sustained prosperity—unless there also are great slashes in our huge annual federal budget deficits. The reductions must be spectacular enough to quash the expectations of inflation, which are self-fulfilling prophecies. The balanced budgets can be postponed.

This is the sobering lesson being shouted to us by our ally Britain, under Prime Minister Thatcher.

Thatcher took office in May 1979 with the goals of cutting British government spending, reducing high tax rates on investment and earnings, curbing the growth in the money supply, revitalizing productivity, and bringing down the rate of inflation. That's "us," isn't it?

At that time, the index of government spending (1975-76 equals 100) was 90.5; in 1980-81 (latest figure), it was 98.5. As a percent of gross domestic product (Britain's total output), government spending then was 38.5 percent, today 40 percent. Government borrowing then was 5.67 billion pounds; today it's 13.5 billion pounds. Government borrowing as a percent of gross domestic product has soared from 3.8 to 6 percent. "Progress?"

In this same span, the rate of rise in consumer prices has sped up from 10.5 percent a year to 12 percent. The unemployment rate soared from 5.4 percent in May 1979 to 10.4 percent this May. Annual growth in industrial production plunged from plus 3.5 percent in May 1979 to minus 9 percent in 1980-81!

About her only achievement has been slowing the rate of growth in the money supply—from an annual 13 percent when she took office to an annual 11.5 percent now.

No wonder the labor riots in Liverpool, the high level of interest on British bonds, the demoralized securities markets in general.

Thatcher has not gained control over British government spending and the British deficit. She has slowed the growth in Britain's money supply, but the entire burden of adjusting to this slower growth has fallen on the private sector.

This, says Dr. William C. Freund, chief economist of the New York Stock Exchange, has caused "an unnecessary and costly contraction in jobs and output. . . . (It) underscores the importance of accompanying large and extended tax cuts with assured reductions in federal spending and deficits."

Don't shrug off Mrs. Thatcher as a bungler, Mr. President! What she has tried we are trying, too. Retreat on your tax cuts, concentrate on slashing our budget deficits—or your economics will fail, Sir.

That's what our own markets are warning you, too.●

OTTO A. TENNANT

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to congratulate Otto A. Tennant, P.E., of Des Moines, Iowa, who was recently elected president of the National Society of Professional Engineers. NSPE is a nationwide organization representing 80,000 individual members involved in all aspects of engineering.

Before taking on this most prestigious position, Otto served as vice chairman of NSPE's north-central region and Professional Engineers in Industry. He also served as chairman of the NSPE Legislative and Government Affairs Committee.

Otto holds a B.S. degree in general engineering from Iowa State University and an M.A. in economics from Drake University.

Currently, Otto is manager of industrial marketing and technical services of Iowa Power & Light Co.

It is an honor for me to congratulate Otto on his recent election and to wish him the best of luck.●

CHIEF JUSTICE NOTES SERIOUS PRISON PROBLEM

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Warren Burger gave a commencement address at the George Washington University School of Law that talks about the state of our corrections system in the United States.

I commend the Chief Justice for speaking out candidly on a problem we are fundamentally ducking.

He calls for the establishment of a national academy to train corrections personnel just as we have had the police academy established by the FBI for police personnel.

Second, he calls for a sensible education/rehabilitation program.

The Chief Justice speaks good—and I am afraid not so common—sense in his discussion.

I urge my colleagues to read it.

REMARKS OF WARREN E. BURGER, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES FOR GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

The ancient American custom of commencement speeches is an innocuous one that has done very little harm to graduates and may have the benefit of teaching them the virtue of patience. And parents, now released from paying the inflated rate of keeping a student in college, are bound to be in such a happy mood today that no speech could depress them!

I have no talent in framing cosmic remarks about the future which terminate with a "handing of the torch" to the survivors of three years of the rigors of a law school. My training as a lawyer is to try to identify problems and seek solutions. That will now be your role.

If there is a "torch" in the problem I discuss today, it is one that will singe your hands and burn your pocketbooks in the years ahead—probably for the rest of your lives. Not serious burns, but some.

Now let me tell you why it is important.

In my annual report to the American Bar Association recently, I discussed the appalling and increasing rate of crime and our apparent inability to cope with it. Since then, two particularly gross criminal acts have shocked the entire world, and underscored the point.

I reminded the American bar that governments were instituted by people primarily for their collective protection. Our own system of government, established 200 years ago—as it has involved—affords more safeguards, more protections, and more benefits for a person accused of crime than any other system of justice in the world. The resolution of guilt is marked by characteristics which make our system unique in the world:

(A) It extends over a longer period of time than in any other judicial system;

(B) It allows for more appeals and more retrials than any other system in the world;

(C) After all appeals are fully exercised, it allows—in fact, it encourages—continued attacks on the conviction even though that conviction has become presumptively final;

(D) But in the final step—the correctional stage—we seem to lose interest and our performance must be judged a failure.

No one questions that a criminal conviction should always be open to correct a miscarriage of justice. But no other system in the world invites our kind of never-ending warfare with society, continuing long after criminal guilt has been established, beyond reasonable doubt, with all the safeguards of due process. Our system has moved thoughtful, sensitive observers who are dedicated to individual liberty to ask: "Is guilt irrelevant?"

On a number of occasions over the past 25 years since I have been a member of the judiciary, I have undertaken to discuss the subject of corrections, correctional practices, and correctional institutions.

That is my subject today. My concern on this subject has led me to visit many such institutions in the United States and even more in the countries of Europe.

Looking back, we see that over the past half century, we have indulged in a certain amount of self-deception with euphemisms, sometimes to sugarcoat the acid pills of reality, and sometimes to express our humane aspirations for those who break our laws: "Prisons" became "penitentiaries"—places of penitence—juvenile prisons became

"reform schools," and more recently, we have begun "halfway houses," without being quite sure halfway from what to what.

None of this is bad. I do not refer to these terms to disparage them or to question the humane impulses that led us to substitute them for the harsh term "prison." Yet it is now beginning to emerge that these terms may reveal our own confusion, and our own lack of direction to achieve the universally accepted objective to lend a helping hand to those who are confined for breaking the law. That we are confused, that we lack direction, is not surprising for we deal here with an intractable problem that has plagued the human race for thousands of years.

I cannot qualify as a professional or as an expert in the field of penology or corrections, but close observations of criminal justice and correctional practices for 25 years have left me with certain impressions. Some of those impressions have changed as reality overtook early hopes and aspirations which I had shared with penologists and judges.

I have long believed—and said—that when society places a person behind walls and bars, it has a moral obligation to take reasonable steps to try to render him or her better equipped to return to a useful life as a member of society. Note, I say "try," and I use the term moral obligation, not legal, not constitutional. The Constitution properly mandates due process; it mandates many protective guarantees, but it mandates nothing concerning the subject of punishments except that they be not "cruel and unusual." The laws aside, to make these people good citizens is also for our own proper self-interest—not just theirs.

Even as recently as 20 or 25 years ago, I shared the hopes of great penologists like James V. Bennett, Torsten Eriksson of Sweden, and Dr. George Sturup of Denmark, and many others that enlightened correctional programs would change and rehabilitate prisoners. With many others, I have had to recognize—to my sorrow—that, broadly speaking, prospects for rehabilitating convicted persons is a great deal less promising than the presumed experts had thought.

To do all the things that might have some chance of changing persons convicted of serious crimes will cost a great deal of money and 1981 is hardly the year in which to propose large public expenditures for new programs to change the physical plants and internal programs of penal institutions. So what I am about to propose our programs of relatively modest fiscal dimensions which I believe will help—but with no guaranteed results.

Estimates on the cost of criminal activity are necessarily speculative. How should we measure murder, rape, or assault? But those who have studied it give estimates as high as over \$100 billion—billion—not million. This is reflected in a range of ways:

- The direct loss suffered by the victims,
- Increased insurance rates,
- Increased security by home-owners and businesses,
- Increased police departments,
- Increased court facilities, and
- Increased public assistance to victims and their families.

To approximate ideal solutions would cost a great deal of money and require a very long-term program. But we should not wait until we can do the whole job—the ideal—however that may be defined. We should

begin where we can, at a level we can afford. Small steps are better than none.

Two steps could reasonably be taken within the range of affordable expenditures. I relate them chiefly because they are affordable in an economic sense—and affordable in terms of the psychology and the political and economic realities of 1981. These proposals are closely related, both bearing on training and education—training of the inmates and training of the keepers.

In 25 years on the bench, I have observed and dealt with more criminal cases, and cases dealing with conditions inside prisons, than I can estimate. I have visited many penal institutions and I assure you a prison is not a pleasant place; it is not even a comfortable place. It probably can never be made either comfortable or pleasant; but neither pleasure nor comfort is the primary object of the enterprise. At its best, it is barely tolerable and even at that level, a penal system is enormously costly—and it is paid for partly by the crime victims on the outside.

In all too many State penal institutions, the personnel—the attendants and guards—are poorly trained and some are not trained at all for the difficult and sensitive role they should perform. There is an astonishing rate of turnover of guards and correctional personnel. One State, widely regarded as having an enlightened correctional system, has a 40-percent annual turnover. One State has 54 percent, one 60 percent, another 65 percent, and another 75-percent turnover.

How can any human enterprise be effective with that rate of turnover of key personnel? The turnover reflects, in part, the appallingly low salaries paid. And I venture to say that there is a correlation between the low salary, the rapid turnover and the amount of training.

Long ago, I observed the marked contrast between the security personnel in the prisons of northern European countries and the prisons in our country. In northern Europe, guards are carefully screened and highly trained; that is as it should be for they are dealing with abnormal people in a very demanding setting. Without special training, prison personnel can become part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

An important and lasting consequence of lack of trained personnel is the impact on the inmate—the individual inmate—who continues his hostility toward society, toward fellow inmates and toward prison personnel. The "keepers" come to be the immediate symbols of the society that keep them confined. Unfortunately, judicial holdings have not always discouraged this warfare. More often than not, inmates go back into society worse for their confinement. Our dreams and hopes concerning rehabilitation have not been realized.

I begin with step one.

At present, there is no single, central facility for the training of prison and correctional personnel, particularly those at the lower and middle levels who work with prisoners on a one-to-one basis. I discussed this subject in 1971 at the Williamsburg Conference on Corrections and this led to the creation of the National Institute of Corrections which has conducted regional seminars to train middle- and upper-echelon prison personnel since 1972.

The operation of a correctional or penal institution is no place for amateurs. It calls for substantial professional training and the highest order of sensitivity, beginning at the guard level. We need look only to the

volume of complaints, the disorders, and riots in these institutions over the past decade to find abundant evidence of this. If the only problem were the control of disorders it might be manageable, even if only by use of raw force, but force is not the solution. In a limited sense, these institutions can be compared with the production lines of Detroit: Recidivism is the penologists' word for "product recall." When prisons turn out "products" with a high rate of recall, we have disaster. And our current rate of recall—recidivist offenders is a disaster. And you will inherit that disaster.

Under the leadership of Norman Carlson, of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and Allen Breed, Director of the National Institute of Corrections, much has been done to improve conditions. But more is needed.

The best of prison administrators cannot change some of the negative conditions unless those in the high-turnover, lower echelons are carefully screened, well-trained, and reasonably paid. Psychological testing of applicants is imperative to screen out people with latent tendencies of hostility. The existing statutory prohibitions on psychological screening must be reexamined. Today, those lower positions in most of the States are generally not paid adequately enough to get minimally qualified people.

One of the great, and perhaps most lasting, contributions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was the founding of the National Police Academy by J. Edgar Hoover. For over 45 years, the FBI has given advanced training to thousands of State and local police personnel. That training has vastly improved the quality of law enforcement in America, both in terms of efficiency and the kind of law enforcement a decent society should achieve. A sheriff, constable, or policeman on the street cannot avoid errors under the fourth amendment, for example, if he or she has not been trained to appreciate the sensitive and elusive nuances of that rule of law. The cost of creating and maintaining the FBI Academy is but a tiny fraction of the benefits it has conferred.

The time is ripe to extend the fine work begun in 1972 by the National Institute of Corrections, and we should proceed at once to create a National Academy of Corrections to train personnel much as the FBI has trained State and local police. This is especially needed for the States which have no real training resources available. The academy should also provide technical assistance to State and local institutions on a continuing basis.

The cost of establishing such an institution, particularly if it could be made as an adjunct at the FBI Academy at Quantico is not great. The physical facilities of classrooms and dormitories could be used interchangeably by both the FBI police training program and the correctional academy. I am reliably informed that the faculty of such an institution could be made up of not more than a dozen permanent staff with the balance of the training conducted by an ad hoc faculty of specialists drawn from the State and Federal systems. Alternatively, the United States could acquire the facilities of a small, centrally located college which is closing its operations. Such a facility could readily be adapted to this purpose.

Now, step two.

The second step for which I would urge consideration is one that would need to be phased over a longer period. We should introduce or expand two kinds of educational programs:

The first would be to make certain that every inmate who cannot read, write, spell, and do simple arithmetic would be given that training—not as an optional matter but as a mandatory requirement. The number of young, functional illiterates in our institutions is appalling. Without these basic skills, what chance does any person have of securing a gainful occupation when that person is released and begins the search for employment—with the built-in handicap of a criminal conviction? To those who view the mandatory aspect as harsh—and some will—I suggest that the total work and study hours of inmates be no greater than we demand of the 15,000 young Americans who are cadets at our service academies—or law students!

Focusing on the longer term prisoner, the second phase of this educational program would require a large expansion of vocational training in the skilled and semiskilled crafts. So that a prisoner would not leave the institution without some qualifications for employment in the construction, manufacturing or service industries, these vocational training programs should also be mandatory. An inmate who declines to cooperate must be motivated to do so by incentives, including shortening the sentence. Just as good behavior credit is now allowed to reduce sentences, we should allow credit on sentences for those who cooperate. We should help them to learn their way out of prison. Rewards and penalties accompany the lives of the cadets I spoke of—and of law students. Why should this not apply to prisoners?

A few days ago I visited with W. Clement Stone, a fine American business leader, who has devoted much of his time and money to improve the lot of prison inmates. He has written and lectured on the crucial role of motivation in the lives of people. Prisoners are people and we must try to motivate them, try to train them, try to instill the self-esteem that is essential to any kind of normal life. We may succeed with only a small percentage, but we must try.

One of the institutions which impressed me in my visits to correctional facilities over the last 25 years was a juvenile prison in Europe. It had on its walls in the main entry lobby four statements which added up to a carrot and a stick. Here is the first thing the new inmate sees when he arrives to begin his term:

First: "You are here because you need help";

Second: "We are here to help you";

Third: "We cannot help you unless you cooperate";

Fourth: "If you don't cooperate, we will make you."

Someone may say that this is a harsh proposition to put to the people who are unfortunate enough to be in prison. But I suggest to you that among the factors which would explain the presence of that person at that place at that time, is that he or she has not been subject to the discipline calling for adherence to certain standards of work and learning. Motivation is absent, but even small successes can spark motivation, and that kind of carrot and stick program provides motivation.

We know that people who have neither learned to learn nor learned to work have little basis for the self-esteem or the esteem for others that is so essential to the human existence.

There is nothing novel in what I am proposing. There are skilled people who have thought about these problems for a long

time who stand ready, willing, and able to implement them if only the Government will act in the areas in which only a National Government can act efficiently.

These are two very small steps in the whole scheme of this melancholy picture of crime in America. They are not necessarily logical starting points, but they are a beginning. The way to get started on any solution is to face the problem and take one or two steps—however small.

Even in this day of necessary budget austerity, I hope that the President and the Congress, in whose hands such matters must rest, will be willing to consider these two modest, but important steps. No one can guarantee results, but if we accept the moral proposition that we are our brothers' keepers and that there is a divine spark in every human being—hard as that is to believe at times—we must try.

For those who are reluctant to finance moral propositions, the hard economics of the cost of crime may offer greater inducement. For yet others, these programs offer the combined appeal of Christian charity and New England frugality.

The "Torch" is now yours. I hope it sings you enough while you earn large fees from affluent clients, to assure your support for these steps, because the consequences of the present system will fall on you and on your children.●

WATT MUST GO

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, rather than serving as steward of the Nation's natural resources, the new Secretary of the Interior seems to have embarked on a campaign to infuriate my constituents. A recent editorial in the Oakland Tribune, a major bay area newspaper of reliably moderate inclinations, had this to say about James Watt's activities:

... therein lies the basic problem with Watt. He seems to be picking issues on the basis of the outrage they are likely to provoke from environmental groups rather than on their merits.

No government decision should be above review. But there is a difference between orderly review of policies and the sort of crash program Watt has started to undo years of effort aimed at protecting the environment.

The full text of this editorial follows for the entertainment and edification of my colleagues:

[From the Oakland Tribune, Apr. 21, 1981]

WATT: HARDLY IN MAINSTREAM

Last Wednesday the National Park Service announced that it will consider letting snowmobiles roar through the now quiet winter landscapes of Yosemite, Lassen and Kings Canyon National Parks.

Last Thursday Interior Secretary James G. Watt said he will take a second look at the California Desert Plan which protects 2 million acres of wilderness.

And on Thursday the Sierra Club launched a campaign to remove Watt from the office, saying he is "at war" with the fundamental idea of environmental protection.

It is an understandable conclusion.

In the three months he has been in office Watt has also abolished the Interior Department office which acquires land for national parks, authorized a study of whether some national parks should be turned over to local areas, proposed canceling of marine sanctuaries, moved to reconsider measures which protect Northern California's wild rivers, solicited proposals from western governors for federally subsidized water projects and reopened debate on the ban on oil and gas drilling off the Northern California coast.

Even some officials of major oil companies are privately critical of Watt's stance on offshore drilling, Sara Terry of the Christian Science Monitor reported last Friday.

According to her story, some oil company officials say that if Watt wanted a show-down with environmentalists, he should have picked an area expected to have larger reserves of oil.

And therein lies the basic problem with Watt. He seems to be picking issues on the basis of the outrage they are likely to provoke from environmental groups rather than on their merits.

In virtually every case the decisions he has reversed or agreed to reconsider were made only after careful study. Take the two possible policy changes announced last week.

The California Desert Plan was adopted after four years of study and the receipt of 40,000 comments. The debate over whether to allow snowmobiles is not merely a question of personal preference. If snowmobiles are allowed to travel over fragile meadows, their weight can compress the snowpack, making it so much colder that it harms fragile plants.

In a statement released in Washington in response to the Sierra Club petition drive, Watt said he "strongly believes he is in the mainstream of the environmental movement." We hope the recall petitions will put him on notice that he is not.

No government decision should be above review. But there is a difference between orderly review of policies and the sort of crash program Watt has started to undo years of effort aimed at protecting the environment.●

COAL SLURRY LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today I cosponsored legislation that, if enacted, would facilitate the construction of coal slurry pipelines. The bill is essentially in a form proposed by the slurry transport industry, and it will act as a starting point for hearings on this important issue. In many aspects, the bill differs from previous legislation. These differences and other points contained in the legislation will be examined closely during the course of the hearings. After committee hearings and after review of the testimony received at those hearings, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation will reach a final position on the type of legislative solution that we

believe will best facilitate the construction of coal slurry pipelines.

Coal is an important natural resource, and the transportation of coal both for domestic and foreign use needs to be reviewed in order to ascertain whether or not the Nation's transportation facilities are adequate to move the coal to domestic and foreign markets. Quite simply, this bill is a transportation bill, nothing less and nothing more—one that will facilitate the construction of coal pipelines across Federal and non-Federal lands. I must add, however, that the committee has conducted hearings on port development and is preparing legislation aimed at developing ports so that the Nation can better transport its goods in foreign markets. The ability of the ports to handle coal traffic is one of the major points that was discussed at those hearings. Thus, the committee has the opportunity to consider the overall transportation policies that exist in the coal transportation marketplace and to take major steps to improve and to increase the ability of this country to move its coal in a better manner. ●

**JAPAN TAKES LONG-RANGE
VIEW ON SPACE: INCREASES
EFFORTS TO COMPETE WITH
THE UNITED STATES**

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal has published an article on the Japanese space program which I believe all Members should read. The article makes two points which I feel are particularly salient. First, Japan has decided space is important to their future and they are getting organized to give it commensurate attention. They are aiming at the world market, and expect it will generate business worth \$4.5 billion to Japan in the mid-1990's. Japanese Government and industry are beginning to work together to make this expectation a reality. Second, the Japanese are contemplating building a space shuttle. That is an eerie thing to learn—it sounds just like Datsun/Honda/Toyota all over again. We do it first and big and make all the mistakes. They do it second and small and learn from our mistakes and pretty soon we are importing from them.

I have always heard that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. I think we had better start imitating the Japanese and get our space program organized. The Journal quotes a spokesman of the Japanese space agency as saying "If we decide to save money now, our descendants may have a grudge against us." We should flatter

the Japanese and incorporate such thinking into our space planning. To do otherwise is extremely shortsighted.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the Wall Street Journal article for the benefit of other Members, and commend it to their attention.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 20, 1981]

**JAPAN SETS MINI-ENTRY IN SPACE RACE
(By Masayoshi Kanabayashi)**

TOKYO.—Now that the U.S. has successfully flown its space shuttle, it's just a matter of time before the Japanese launch their own, smaller "Columbia" and begin exporting it to the U.S.

So went a joke that made the rounds here recently. As it happens, though, the joke contains at least a kernel of truth. It's still a sketch on a drawing board, and it isn't likely to take off until the 1990s, but Japan is indeed mulling a possible "mini" space shuttle.

"Just as we need a bus, we also need a mini-car," says a spokesman for Japan's National Space Development Agency, or NASDA, a government-sponsored corporation charged with putting Japan's budding space program into effect.

The mini-shuttle, which hasn't been officially authorized by the government yet, is just one part of that program. Since 1970, Japan has put 22 satellites into orbit, but three of them had to be launched for Japan by the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or NASA, because Japan lacks rockets with sufficient power for heavy satellites.

So one thrust of Japan's space program is building bigger rockets. It's developing one capable of carrying a 1,100 pound satellite into orbit and last February it launched one that can carry 770 pounds.

Another project is the mini-shuttle. Although smaller than Columbia, it would have most of the U.S. shuttle's basic functions, including jet engines that would enable it to land in Japan for reuse. On the blueprints, the mini-shuttle measures 46 feet long and 24.5 feet wide, weighs 10 tons and can carry a crew of four plus 1,100 pounds of cargo.

Why does Japan need a space program in the first place? The answer seems to be part national pride, part a calculation that the technology developed by a space program will be critical to Japan's economic future. There is a feeling here that Japan, with its almost total lack of natural resources, has staked its future on high technology to such an extent that it can't afford to fall behind in critical technological areas. What supports the feeling is the realization that in downgrading its military as it has, Japan already lags in weapons technology.

"The present outer space is just like a virgin land in the sailing ship era," declares a pamphlet issued by NASDA. "If other countries get a patent license on new materials made in space or obtain medicine which is good enough to meet the world demand in small quantity, the impact on Japan will be great."

Moved by sentiments like those, Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry, or MITI, has begun taking steps to transform Japan's space program from a loosely organized network of research projects into an industry. Its first step, taken last fall, was to set up an advisory body to study the prospects for such an industry.

And the advisory body recently concluded: Space will be a \$4.5 billion industry for Japanese manufacturers by the mid-1990s, comparable in size to today's radio and television manufacturing industry.

Moreover, the advisory body recommended that the Japanese space industry "aim at the world market," and urged that the government "provide active assistance." Regarding satellites specifically, the advisory body said that for the time being, "one way to win orders" would be to develop products jointly with foreign firms. "But in the long term," the advisory body said, "it is desirable for a group of Japanese companies to obtain the ability to enter the world market solely on their own."

A SMALL INDUSTRY

If the Japanese space industry accomplishes all that, it will have come a long way indeed. Today, although some 70 Japanese companies do space work, sales are less than \$480 million—about the size of Japan's underwear industry. Exports constitute about 20% of the industry's current sales, but most of that is ground-station equipment, such as antenna systems. The rest is sales to the Japanese government for use in broadcasting, weather forecasting, resource surveying and other programs.

Of the 70 companies, six account for two-thirds of the annual business and are likely to be among the mainstays of the industry's future. They're Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd., Nippon Electric Co., Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries Ltd., Nissan Motor Co., Mitsubishi Electric Corp. and Toshiba Corp.

Company officials say none of the Japanese concerns is currently making money on its space business. They say the main priority is to increase technological prowess by taking part in the space program.

Launching rockets, for example, isn't a commercial business today, but when it does become one, says Yoshihide Hiraiwa, senior manager of Mitsubishi Electric, Japan will bring a great strength to the international competition—its ability to make high-quality products. "If Japan had manufactured the Columbia, the tiles would never have fallen off," Mr. Hiraiwa says.

In the future, Mr. Hiraiwa believes, the U.S. will continue to lead the free world in developing new space technology. But a good deal of the manufacturing, he hopes, will take place in Japan.

HOLES IN THE NET

Everyone, to be sure, isn't as optimistic about the Japanese space industry's future as the advisory body and Mr. Hiraiwa. Many company officials insist that it will be more difficult for Japan to excel in an industry that, unlike auto and television manufacture, isn't geared toward mass-production. Only two or three rockets are launched in Japan each year.

But other space industry proponents dismiss such pessimism. Someday, space could be a mass-production industry, they maintain. And although Japan is currently five to ten years behind in the space race, a NASDA official notes that "Japan has come through holes in the net of American technology in the past (in such sectors as automobiles and electronics), so there could be similar holes in the future as well."

But the way some Japanese talk, it seems likely that Japan will pursue its space program if only for the technological spin-off. "It's a high added-value industry," notes the advisory body, but more importantly it is necessary "for the realization of a desirable

industrial structure in Japan . . . As unilateral introduction of technologies from foreign countries is getting more difficult, it is necessary to strengthen Japan's own bargaining power through accumulation of necessary technological know-how."

Or, as the NASDA spokesman puts it, "if we decide to save money now, our descendants may have a grudge against us."●

A TRIBUTE TO ROSE FITZGERALD KENNEDY ON HER 91ST BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 91st birthday of Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, truly one of America's grand ladies. To my knowledge she is the only American woman who has raised three of her sons to become U.S. Senators and has seen one of them become the President of our country.

Born July 22, 1890, as the oldest of the six children of John Francis Fitzgerald and his wife, Josephine Mary, Rose Kennedy indeed has shown the world that home is where character is built and where sacrifices are made to assure the happiness of others and where love is deeply lavished.

As the daughter of a father who served as the mayor of Boston in 1906 and as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Rose Fitzgerald developed her charismatic sense of community and political life while cherishing her devotion to home and church. She was selected as the prettiest girl in Boston when she graduated with honors from high school at the age of 15. Her love for music was nurtured by her attendance at the New England Conservatory and her deep sense of commitment to her Nation and fellow man blossomed while she attended the Convent of the Sacred Heart in Boston and Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart in Purchase, N.Y.

Her fondness for the French and German languages and the opera grew while she attended Blumenthal Academy, a German convent in the Netherlands.

Upon her return she dutifully performed as a cosmopolitan hostess for the mayor of Boston, a job she found "boring." She served as a volunteer in many areas teaching catechism and working in the library in the North End of Boston. She developed an organization aimed at the study of national and international affairs.

On October 7, 1914, she married Joseph Patrick Kennedy who became Ambassador to Great Britain. While absorbed by her duties as a wife and mother she never lost interest in community life.

They were the parents of nine children, including Joseph, Jr., who was

killed in action serving with the U.S. forces in Great Britain in 1944; John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who became a U.S. Senator and was assassinated while President of the United States in 1963; Rosemary, Kathleen, Eunice, Patricia, Robert F. Kennedy, who also served as a U.S. Senator and was killed by an assassin's bullet in 1968; Jean, and Edward M. Kennedy, who now serves in the U.S. Senate.

The grief over the loss of three sons was compounded by the lengthy illness and death of her husband in 1969. Through it all, Rose Kennedy has held her head high, proclaiming "God never sends us a cross too heavy for us to bear."

There is no question in the minds of persons throughout the world that her religious faith has helped her greatly in her refusal to be conquered by her grief. Her leadership is proof positive that the Nation is proudest and noblest which has the greatest number of outstanding women, wives and mothers.

In recognition for her work in the Roman Catholic Church Rose Kennedy was made a papal countess by Pope Pius XII.

In 1970 she traveled to Ethiopia where she dedicated a library in memory of the late John F. Kennedy at Haile Selassie University.

Rose Kennedy has been described as "91 years young" by her son Senator TED KENNEDY and is reported in excellent health, attending Mass every day, enjoying golf and long walks at Hyannis port beach and swimming whenever possible in the chilly Atlantic Ocean. In her more recent years Rose F. Kennedy has worked raising funds for those who are mentally retarded, expressing "I have benefited a good many people in this fight."

I salute Rose F. Kennedy as a symbol of hope and courage. She has shown that hope indeed awakens courage and that those who can implant courage in the human soul are among the world's best physicians.

I am certain that my colleagues will want to join with me today in this tribute to Rose F. Kennedy who has given the world the gift of consideration, the gift of gratitude, the gift of courage, and the gift of inspiration.●

JOHNSTON SHOWS WHAT THE REAGAN ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM IS ALL ABOUT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues an event which took place this past week in the Fourth Congressional District of New York, which I have the

honor to represent. It was an event which demonstrated an essential truth about our great country and its future if President Reagan's economic recovery program is fully implemented.

On July 17, a Nassau County businessman, Mr. Robert Johnston broke ground for a new 80,000-square-foot refrigerated warehouse for his Harbor Distributing Corp. in Hicksville, N.Y. He is investing some \$3,500,000 in this new warehouse, which will nearly double the company's storage capacity.

Mr. Speaker, \$3,500,000 is a huge sum for a small businessman to invest at any time. In the light of current economic conditions, it requires great courage to make such a substantial investment. It also requires firm confidence in future economic growth. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I feel my colleagues should be aware of this event. For Bob Johnston's investment is, in fact, a microcosm of what the Reagan economic recovery program is all about. And it demonstrates how the Reagan economic recovery program will work to revitalize our economy.

As the primary wholesaler for Anheuser-Busch products in Nassau County, N.Y., and nearby areas, the Harbor Distributing Corp. provides employment for 125 persons. The new storage facility is being built because sales are expected to increase. If sales increase by as much as \$4,000,000 during the next 2 years, Bob tells me that would mean 25 additional jobs with his company. And, of course, the increased sales would also mean many thousands of dollars in additional tax revenues flowing into local, State, and Federal governments.

Mr. Speaker, imagine small businessmen all over the country making similar investments in new or expanded business facilities. Think of the thousands of jobs that would be created by such activity. Think of the millions of dollars in additional tax revenues pouring in to local, State, and Federal governments from these business activities.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what President Reagan's economic recovery program is designed to accomplish. The President's plan curbs inflation by limiting Federal spending; it encourages investment in new business activity through a 25-percent reduction in individual income tax rates and through increased business depreciation allowances. The President's program, by helping businesses to modernize and expand, will revitalize the American economy. And every one of us benefits from a prosperous, growing economy.

So, Mr. Speaker, Bob Johnston's decision to build a new warehouse in Nassau County provides us with a demonstration of the benefits our

Nation can expect from President Reagan's economic recovery program. The spending ceilings Congress voted on the fiscal year 1982 budget have provided the foundation for the program. Now, the Congress must complete the task by approving the President's simple, but effective, tax reduction program. I call upon my colleagues to support the President's tax reduction plan, and thereby help Bob Johnston and the thousands upon thousands of businessmen like him across our Nation. Give them the power to revitalize our economy.

I congratulate Bob for his courage and enterprise in forging ahead with this new project, and I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him every success.●

CLOSE THE LOG EXPORT LOOPHOLE

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has restricted the export of Federal timber ever since the national forest system was created more than 80 years ago.

Unfortunately, a loophole in this policy allows significant volumes of public logs to enter the log export trade in indirect fashion. This practice threatens the survival of many small- and medium-sized mills. It robs American workers of jobs that would otherwise be created to process that timber domestically, and it raises the cost of wood and wood products within the United States.

The House today can close that loophole by adopting Congressman Weaver's amendment to H.R. 4035, the fiscal year 1982 Interior appropriations bill. I strongly support this amendment and urge its adoption.

The loophole exists because, under current regulations, private timber companies can export their own logs and then buy Federal timber from third parties for processing in their mills. The practice is known as third-party substitution and continues despite clear congressional intent to the contrary.

An 1897 statute first prescribed procedures for selling Federal timber. Such sales were subject to a proviso that timber sold from a national forest reservation shall "be used in the State or territory in which such timber reservation may be situated but not for export therefrom."

In 1926, that restriction was relaxed to permit Federal timber exports upon determination that the timber was not needed locally. By the 1960's, this proved to be a mistake. The Japanese substantially increased their pur-

chases of logs from public forests. The demand drove up prices; a shortage of Federal timber developed in the Pacific Northwest. Many local processing mills were forced to curtail or to shut down operations.

In April 1968, the Department of Agriculture placed a 1-year ceiling on export sales from Federal forests in western Washington and Oregon. Senator Wayne Morse also introduced legislation to extend the ceiling to slightly higher levels for 5 years throughout the Western States. The legislation, which was enacted, authorized "rules and regulations to carry out its purposes, including the prevention of substitution of timber restricted from export by this section for exported non-Federal timber."

During floor debate, Senator Morse said that,

Public confidence in the use of Federal timber must be maintained by taking all possible steps to assure that substitution does not occur. That is why the appropriate Secretaries are specifically authorized to prevent it. . . .

Congress extended the log export ceiling in 1970. It expired in 1973, but Congress then adopted appropriations language designed to cause the Agriculture and Interior Departments to take more vigorous action to prevent national forest log exports. That language remains in effect today.

The language states that no appropriations shall be made for use for any sale of unprocessed timber from Federal lands in the West which will be "exported from the United States, or which will be used as a substitute for timber from private lands which is exported by the purchasers."

The Weaver amendment would strike the last three words. There are those who believe that the inclusion of the words "by the purchasers" was intended by Congress to give industry a loophole. There is not one shred of evidence to support that assertion.

Congressman Dellenbach said on the floor in 1973 that the committee expected the Secretaries to:

Publish regulations to implement this legislation. The power to do so has been on the books for some time. The Secretaries have failed to use that power, and I am delighted to see that the committee is speaking strongly and that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior are warned that this is something they are to do.

And the report accompanying the 1974 appropriations act said:

In the future sales (of unprocessed timber), the committee expects the Secretaries to take steps to include provisions in timber sales contracts that the timber involved will not be exported, or used by the purchaser as a substitute for timber he exports, or sells for export. The committee expects the Secretaries to publish regulations to implement this limitation and the act of 1926 . . . so as to control substitution of Federal timber for private timber sold for export.

The Forest Service thereafter adopted regulations restricting the export of unprocessed Federal timber or its use as a substitute for timber from private lands exported by the purchaser. These regulations, however, deal only with direct substitution by the Federal timber purchaser. They do not restrict the replacement of exported private timber with unprocessed Federal timber purchased from a third party. The Weaver amendment would close the third-party loophole.

An analyst for the Northwest Independent Forest Manufacturers, which represents many mills whose future depends upon a continuing supply of Federal timber for domestic processing, calculates that substitution is a 200 million board-foot a year problem in western Washington State and along the Columbia River.

The high volume of log exports and the dwindling supply of logs available to small independent mills continues to tilt the balance in favor of the larger companies. Closing the substitution loophole will simply permit all companies—large and small—to compete effectively.

In log export areas, there are two very distinct log markets—export and domestic. Export log prices are higher than domestic log prices. Exporters of private logs can take a portion of their profits from log exports and pay more for logs purchased from Federal lands than those sawmills that are completely dependent on Federal timber.

The effect of substitution on small, timber-dependent communities is obvious. When Federal logs are drawn away, local employment dries up. The intrusion of log exporters into the Federal timber market also tends to increase prices that the homebuilding and construction industries must pay for wood products.

Under current law, companies owning private timber are free to do what they wish with those logs. The Weaver amendment would not change that situation, but it would reassert congressional intent that unprocessed Federal timber should not be funneled indirectly into the log export trade.●

THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which supports the call of the President for a cease-fire on the part of all parties involved in the Middle East conflict currently.

The country of Lebanon, which has always been our ally, continues to be exploited. Hundreds of people were recently killed and wounded by the recent Israeli air strike on Beirut. Most of these people were civilians, including women and children. In addition, countless bridges and buildings were destroyed, resulting in millions of dollars of devastation.

Israelis have in return experienced civilian loss by Palestinian retaliation. This violence must end. It is only

through dialog and a cease-fire that peace can be achieved. At this time, in nonpartisan resolution, we should support the President in calling for a cease-fire. The following is the text of the resolution.

H. RES. 192

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President continue to call for a cease fire along the Lebanese-Israeli border and to provide strong leadership to help insure peace and stability in Lebanon and Israel and the entire Middle East region

Whereas, the Middle East is once again the object of intense and fierce fighting;

Whereas, hundreds of victims have been killed in recent attacks in the region and hundreds of civilians wounded;

Whereas, the diplomatic mission of Philip C. Habib is working under difficult circumstances to prevent another war from occurring in the Middle East;

Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives to urge the President of the United States to continue to press for a cease fire along the Lebanese-Israeli border and to provide strong leadership to help insure peace and stability in the countries of Lebanon and Israel and in the entire Middle East region.●

AMERICA'S FUTURE IS IN SPACE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about two different ways of viewing the future.

One way says we face a future of diminishing resources and increasing chaos as we fight over those diminishing resources. Those who hold this view think that mankind has reached the limit not only of physical resources but of mental and spiritual resources as well.

The other view is of a future filled not with despair but with hope; not with problems but with opportunities; not with diminishing resources but with increasing knowledge to develop new resources. This is the historical view, for as we look at the history of mankind on this planet, we see a series of critical periods when one group of people wanted to give up because they couldn't see beyond the problems in the context of the past, and another group kept its minds open and found new ways around old problems and made the breakthroughs that brought us to where we are today, both technologically and sociologically.

We're at one of those critical periods now. The people who believe in the future are calmly and methodically going about working on the solutions while the doomsayers prepare for the end.

The bill I'm introducing today provides the framework for the technological developments that will over-

come the hurdles mankind faces into the next century.

Research and development of new technology takes place only in pursuit of a specific goal. The goal which we are coming closer and closer to reaching is the exploration and development of resources in space.

Last April, two U.S. astronauts and their space vehicle were guided out of orbit and entered Earth's atmosphere at an incredible speed. Crossing whole countries in a matter of minutes, with absolutely no source of power in case of a mistake, they cruised to a perfect landing on a tiny piece of real estate.

The success of the maiden voyage of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* caused Americans to swell up with pride and brought a renewed patriotism. But more importantly, it reminded us that the only limits to the future are in the human mind and its ability to bridge the gap between belief and unbelief.

That is why I am introducing the National Space and Aeronautics Policy Act of 1981. The legislation sets clear goals for America in space. And so that freedom follows wherever we go, it also provides for the government of Americans in space.

To do this, I have reached into history and taken a few paragraphs from Thomas Jefferson's "Northwest Ordinance of 1784." Jefferson provided for Americans as they explored the Northwest Territory, "... * * * for their constitutional protection, the establishment of territorial governments and their eventual statehood."

I would like to borrow a few more words from another famous U.S. President, John F. Kennedy. He said:

Now is the time to take longer strides * * * time for a great new American enterprise * * * time for this Nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement which, in many ways, holds the key to our future on Earth.

Jefferson and Kennedy both knew that advancing into a new region isn't foreign to Americans. It is a natural part of our history.

There's another reason to move ahead with a national policy for space exploration and development. The rest of the world understands that space is the next frontier, and they are preparing.

Both our allies and our adversaries are setting clear, long-range goals for their own national space programs.

The United Nations has scheduled a conference for July 1982, in Vienna to discuss how the resources and benefits of space shall be allocated. The United States must address these international issues of space now, or we will be caught off guard.

If America does not compete in space, we abandon world leadership to those who do.●

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works heard some important testimony today on transportation needs by Thomas D. Larson, secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation. I share his statement for consideration by the entire Congress. As we begin to plan for the future and prepare for greater local responsibility and creativity, we need to act with care. Secretary Larson's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS D. LARSON, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

I. INTRODUCTION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Thomas D. Larson. I am Secretary of Transportation for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify before you today on transportation needs.

I have structured my remarks to first address highways, specifically capital needs for the Interstate system and bridges. I would then like to turn to mass transit, focusing mainly on non-capital requirements.

Today, each of the fifty states has a well-developed transportation system, made possible through a massive investment of public funds. But the decade of the 80's, already marked by new demographic realities and severely constrained budgets, causes us to reassess where we are and where we are going. In particular, the 80's must be the decade in which we face up to the enormous task of providing proper maintenance on our now crumbling transportation system.

II. COMPLETION OF THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

We all agree that the time has come to complete the Interstate system. But, what is completion? Under the present definition, completion will cost \$54 billion, and at that level is simply unattainable by 1990—if ever! Consequently, several proposals have been developed which redefine the cost to complete. For example, Pennsylvania has worked within the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the National Governors' Association (NGA) to scale down the cost to complete. The NGA/AASHTO position redefines the cost to complete at approximately \$42 billion. Both houses of Congress, as you are aware, and the Administration have also redefined completion. Costs range from \$37 billion (H.R. 3210) to \$31.5 billion (Administration S. 841) to \$26 billion (S. 1024).

If completion were limited to the cost of closing remaining gaps of national significance, the cost to complete comes down to \$12 billion—a readily achievable objective by 1990. In fact, this approach enables completion by 1990 at an annual program level of \$1.5 billion.

The problems of apportionment and lapse of funds could be eliminated by moving directly to a national schedule for completion. The states, in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration, would jointly de-

velop a schedule for completing nationally significant gaps by 1990. Congress would review and approve this multi-year obligation plan biennially in much the same way that the Interstate Cost Estimate is now reviewed and approved by Congress. The situation where, in the last three years, the Northeastern states have "donated" over \$1.7 billion to an Interstate Discretionary Fund could be avoided through this approach. The growing need to restore, preserve and enhance the existing Interstate System—now recognized as perhaps the most urgent national highway problem—could be financed through a greatly expanded 4R program.

III. RESTORATION, PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT

The NGA/AASHTO position recognizes that preservation of the existing Interstate system is equally important to completing it. The national consensus is to address Interstate preservation through an Interstate 4R (resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction) program. Implicit in the proposed 4R program is the concept of enhancement. That is, the amenities now included in the cost to complete would be eligible under the new 4R program.

The keys to a successful 4R program are adequate funding and a fair and equitable apportionment formula which still addresses needs. By redefining cost to complete so that it can be funded at \$1.5 billion per year, Interstate 4R could be funded as high as \$3.5 billion per year.

Why \$3.5 billion a year? Allow me to give you an example from Pennsylvania. We feel that the Interstate Highway System is so important to the economic revitalization of the Northeast that we have made restoration and preservation of the Interstate System our number one priority. To demonstrate our commitment, we have already invested \$13 million in Primary funds (since July of 1979) for restoration work on Interstate 80. This fiscal year, we plan to spend another \$23 million (in Primary funds) for additional restoration work on Interstate 80. At the same time, our 10,000-mile Primary system also has massive and urgent restoration requirements.

Other states like Florida are struggling to add capacity to their Interstate System to keep pace with the additional traffic generated by a more than 40 percent increase in population over the past decade. The new Interstate 4R program must be both adequately funded and sufficiently flexible to enable such divergent needs to be addressed.

Because the Interstate 4R program will eventually become the highest priority national program, apportionment is extremely critical. Apportionment must be fair and equitable and at the same time reflect those factors which add to the cost of restoring, preserving and enhancing the system. As you know, the current parameters for Interstate 3R apportionment are Interstate lane miles and vehicle miles. All current proposals—H.R. 3210, S. 1024 and S. 841 (Administration)—have recommended the continuation of these two parameters with the only variation being in the weighting.

In the NGA/AASHTO position, factors other than lane miles and vehicle miles that contribute to pavement deterioration are recommended (such as weather, truck traffic and terrain). We have been working in conjunction with the AASHTO Task Force on Highway Legislation on a formula which would consider such factors.

Building upon the 4R concept, I would like to take a moment and briefly discuss a

program option which, when taken together with a \$12 billion Interstate completion program, would provide what we consider to be a "Balanced Approach" to the Interstate program. In effect, I would expand the 4R program to include the construction of locally significant gaps, since only nationally significant gaps would be eligible under a \$12 billion Interstate completion program. The completion of locally significant gaps is estimated to cost \$13 billion. Under this new program, which is designed to support the restoration, preservation and enhancement of the Interstate system, states would be given the additional flexibility to complete all other work which would be defined out of the Interstate Cost Estimate. This is precisely the kind of flexibility that's needed to bridge regional differences in Interstate needs at a time when resources are severely limited and costs continue to escalate at unreasonably rapid rates.

To further broaden the scope of this program, I would also propose the option of transferring apportionments to other Federal-aid highway categories in those states where Interstate highways were being adequately maintained and certified as such by the Federal Highway Administration. By including the transferability option, we preclude the need for a future Interstate Transfer program as presently structured. All prior Interstate Transfer approvals would continue to receive annual appropriations as they now do. A \$3.5 billion program level has been assumed, since under this "Balanced Approach", Interstate completion would require only \$1.5 billion.

IV. BRIDGES

Bridges are of extreme importance to Pennsylvania. Many local and regional economies depend heavily on the access afforded by key river and stream crossings. Remove that access, through weight restrictions or closings, and total system disruption occurs. Nationwide, bridge needs are estimated to be in excess of \$30 billion.

The NGA/AASHTO position supports the bridge program as a categorical element of the Federal-aid highway program. In Pennsylvania, we endorse that position. We further support a strong bridge discretionary program to help finance "big ticket" projects.

V. MASS TRANSIT

I'll now turn to mass transit. Pennsylvania has proven its commitment to public transportation. We rank fourth in the nation with respect to state-financed operating assistance. Last fiscal year, Pennsylvania spent \$112 million in state funds. For this current state fiscal year, we plan to make \$140 million in operating assistance payments to the Commonwealth's transit agencies. In view of our commitment, we are doing all that we can to encourage greater local participation in public transportation, particularly now that we are facing the possible elimination of Federal operating assistance. We are working with members of the Pennsylvania General Assembly toward the enactment of local tax enabling legislation, a local tax option which presently does not exist.

We support the proposal to place increased emphasis on the modernization of existing rail and bus systems. Pennsylvania now contributes approximately \$25 million per year in state funds toward the capital requirements of our transit systems. This program would be enhanced if capital assistance were made available for heavy maintenance as well as new facilities.

We believe that there is much more that the Federal government can do to encourage transit usage. For example, Federal tax credits could be established for employers who pay all or a portion of employee transit costs through prepaid weekly, monthly or even yearly transit passes. Tax credits could also be offered to employers who offer direct financial assistance or subsidy to transit operating agencies. In the area of regulatory reform and other cost reduction opportunities, we support the steps now underway to provide a local option on how best to meet the transportation needs of the handicapped. Section 13(c) labor sign-off requirements have become overly burdensome and need immediate attention. Relaxation of Federally-imposed specifications and procurement requirements are in order as well.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to commend both the Administration and the members of this committee on the progress made in addressing key areas of national need in the transportation sector. Concerning highways, I would encourage a central focus on removing the irrationality that the Interstate program increasingly poses by defining an equitable, achievable completion. Further, I urge that we move quickly to restore, preserve and enhance the nation's existing Interstate system with a Federal program complementary to the varying needs of the states. The basic elements of our future Federal/state partnership have been identified in the legislative proposals advanced thus far but resolving details is now the key to final resolution. Where complete data was available, we have done some additional analyses of the highway proposals.

Greater local responsibility and creativity in the Federal role must attend future transit funding. Pennsylvania now carries a major transit support role. We believe local interests are willing to do more.

Again, I thank you for this opportunity. ●

SOIL SAVING INCENTIVE THROUGH FAIR TAX TREATMENT

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing with cosponsors the Soil and Water Conservation Act of 1981, H.R. 2515, which was earlier introduced on March 13. This is identical legislation with S. 569 as introduced in the Senate by Senator JEPSEN.

This act would allow investment tax credit on those expenditures incurred by a landowner or operator related to the application of soil and water conservation practices on their land. It is the purpose of this act to encourage the application of these measures in an effort to preserve our Nation's most vital resource—our land.

By providing this incentive to farmers, this measure will encourage more serious consideration of wise stewardship of the Nation's soil and water resources.

H.R. 2515 provides a choice to those who incur conservation-related expenses by permitting them to take either a deduction of up to 25 percent of their gross income in the year the expense is incurred, or, if they prefer, to take a 10-percent investment tax credit for the year of the initial investment. Depreciation deductions for those improvements which are deductible would apply according to the standard depreciation schedule.

Since the initial introduction of this bill, Senator JEPSEN and I sought and have received a revenue estimate from the Joint Committee on Taxation. That committee has replied with its estimate of Treasury exposure. In fiscal year 1981 the revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury as a result of this bill would be about \$9 million due to claims of either type. In fiscal year 1982, \$25 million; fiscal year 1983, \$27 million; fiscal year 1984, \$30 million; fiscal year 1985, \$31 million; and in fiscal year 1986, approximately \$34 million would be lost to the U.S. Treasury as a result of this bill once approved.

Surely these are minute losses of Federal funds when compared with the potential soil which could be saved as a result of putting in place the practices which are thoroughly proved as savers of our soil and water. In addition to farmland benefits, there are sizable additional benefits to the entire Nation in the form of cleaner, silt-free lakes and streams when these practices are in place on lands feeding into those bodies of water.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join our colleagues Mr. STANGELAND of Minnesota; Mr. EMERSON of Missouri; Mr. BEDELL of Iowa; Mr. WEBER of Minnesota; Mr. JEFFRIES of Kansas; Mr. KOGOVSEK of Colorado; Mr. BARNARD of Georgia, in encouraging early hearings on this legislation in order that it might be approved during this session of Congress.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the efforts of the committee to make a positive contribution to the cause of peace, justice, and human rights in Northern Ireland.

Clearly, Ireland has seen too much violence and turmoil. I believe it is vital for Congress to speak out on this critical issue.

Here are just a few of the efforts of our committee to further the cause of human rights in Northern Ireland:

I. ARMS TO THE ROYAL ULSTER CONSTABULARY (RUC)

In 1979, the U.S. State Department announced a suspension of arms sales to the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), the main police force in Northern Ireland. The RUC has been cited by the European Commission and Court on Human Rights and Amnesty International for various forms of inhumane treatment of prisoners and suspects under their control. The British Government appointed a special commission to investigate the Amnesty charges and this panel confirmed their findings.

Many members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs were concerned that President Reagan would lift this suspension of arms sales. I joined several of my colleagues in writing a letter to the President, urging that the embargo be maintained. We were subsequently assured by the White House that:

The administration is holding to the policy of not approving licensing for sale of handguns to the RUC.

II. U.S. TRAINING OF BRITISH TROOPS

Concerned about reports that British troops are being trained at U.S. military facilities for later stationing in Northern Ireland, the ad hoc committee requested that Secretary of Defense Weinberger investigate these reports. In a letter to the ad hoc committee's chairman, Congressman MARIO BIAGGI, the Under Secretary of Defense noted that the training of British military personnel is authorized under the Arms Export Control Act and is an integral part of our mutual obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty. Under Secretary Fred Ikle wrote:

Our cooperation with the United Kingdom is solely for the purposes of our NATO mission . . . not for internal police functions.

I consider this response interim in nature, and have been assured by my good friend, Mr. BIAGGI, that this issue will be pursued by the ad hoc committee.

III. HOUSE RESOLUTION 158

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of House Resolution 158, which calls on Great Britain to "exercise greater urgency and flexibility in finding a humanitarian solution to the hunger strike crisis." This bill is vital to demonstrate congressional concern for the British Government's intransigence in resolving the hunger strikes, and I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this measure.

IV. ECONOMIC SUMMIT IN OTTAWA

I joined several of my colleagues in an appeal to President Reagan to speak directly with Prime Minister Thatcher in Ottawa to urge her to initiate all possible steps to bring about a humanitarian resolution to the hunger strikes. I believe that a personal communication from the President would

have served as a dramatic illustration to Mrs. Thatcher that this matter is of profound national concern.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the efforts of the ad hoc congressional committee to contribute to the search for peace and justice in Northern Ireland. Our efforts will continue in the hopes of ending violence on all sides of this conflict. I urge my colleagues in the House to join the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs and thus demonstrate their commitment to the cause of peace in Northern Ireland.●

PROTECTING THE CIVIL SERVICE FROM POLITICAL RETALIATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of the committee for the fine report accompanying the Interior appropriations bill. This report documents all the ways in which Secretary Watt has recognized offices within the Interior Department to suit his own ideological purposes. Along with many of my colleagues here, I fear justifiably that Secretary Watt's reorganization of two such offices, the Office of Aircraft Services and the Office of Surface Mining, would destroy completely their effectiveness.

In carrying out his reorganization of the Interior Department, Watt has attempted to subvert not only environmental regulations legislated by Congress, but also the work of nonpolitical employees who see that those regulations are carried out. On March 20, the Secretary announced that due to budgetary constraints caused by the "waste, fraud, and mismanagement" of the previous administration, he had to release 51 employees under a reduction in force; 14 of the 51 employees released has been specially recruited from the finest law schools around the country to participate in the annual honors attorney program. At that time, the attorneys who were released claimed that Watt was using a "budget smokescreen to purge employees not considered politically reliable by the new administration."

As chairman of Oversight and Investigations I have looked closely at this reduction in force. Along with Chairman SCHROEDER and Chairman DINGELL, I asked the Secretary to defer the reduction in force until he could show us that budgetary constraints were indeed the cause. The Secretary responded in a letter to us on June 2 that there was so little money in the budget of the Office of the Solicitor that he had no other choice. On June

15, however, less than 2 weeks later, he advertised six positions in this very same office, positions for which the honors attorneys were certainly eligible.

The Office of the Solicitor has assured us that they had taken attrition into account before they decided to carry out the reduction in force. But GAO has recently informed us that in going over the budget figures of this office, attrition was not taken into consideration. That certainly sounds like mismanagement to me. As for waste, what about the wasted talent of 14 honors attorneys released from their work, some of whom have not found jobs yet?

Mr. Speaker, we, here in Congress, must protect the civil service from political retaliation by Secretary Watt. We did away with the spoils approach to Government over 100 years ago by establishing the civil service system. We should not allow Secretary Watt to reinstitute the spoils system now. We must continue to take congressional action to block this kind of political abuse of the civil service system. ●

A GLITTERING ECONOMY

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker testified before the House Banking Committee, on which I serve. It should come as no surprise that the discussion focused on interest rates—the reasons for current near record levels, the impact of high rates on businesses, large and small, and on individuals, and the effect Fed policy is having on inflation.

While I have not been as critical of Chairman Volcker as many of our colleagues, primarily because I feel the Fed is committed to reducing inflation, the fact remains that high interest rates are having an increasingly negative impact on important sectors of our economy, such as housing, automobiles, and small businesses.

I therefore think it is essential that we begin to seriously consider alternatives to our present monetary policy. One proposal that is receiving increasing attention is a return to the gold standard in some form. In this regard, I commend the following editorial by Lewis Lehrman to the attention of our colleagues.

A GLITTERING ECONOMY

President Reagan was elected to end inflation and restore the economy. He is moving in that direction by slowing down monetary growth, reducing federal spending increases, cutting tax increases and eliminating some costly government regulations.

But the economic program will not work without a balanced budget and the gold

standard. Without these, interest rates will come down only slowly from 20 percent, and demoralized financial markets will not recover.

Some presidential advisers and the Federal Reserve may try to force a recession and higher unemployment to bring down interest rates more quickly. But no compassionate person can really want to cure inflation and high interest rates with worklessness.

By itself, gradually reducing the rate of growth in the money supply will not work. We need something other than austerity and monetarism. Thatcherism will work no better here than it has in England.

Together, a balanced budget and a monetary reform based on gold will quickly reduce interest rates. The currency would be stabilized, along with the market for government securities, and inflationary expectations would evaporate.

Such a policy, with economic expansion as its goal, is clearly implied in the 1980 Republican platform, which stated: "One of the most urgent tasks in the period ahead will be the restoration of a dependable monetary standard—that is, an end to inflation."

Last year, Congress established a commission to study the gold standard. Its task is to examine an institution ridiculed by most academic economists and almost all politicians. Their feelings are natural, because the gold standard would end political and bureaucratic manipulation of the money supply. So would an annually balanced federal budget.

A gold standard puts control over money in the hands of the people. A balanced budget would return savings to the marketplace for growth and new jobs. In a free market, the people could decide between a gold and a paper dollar.

I believe, given a true choice, that Americans will choose the gold dollar as their money, just as they will choose a balanced budget, at the present level of tax receipts, as the basis for financial order. A true gold standard and a balanced budget will give us 4 percent interest rates, and there is no other way to get them.

For most of our life as a nation, we had stable prices and low interest rates under the gold standard. After mercantilist trade wars had wrecked the world economy and the international monetary system, President Roosevelt abandoned the gold standard domestically in 1934. President Johnson abandoned international convertibility in 1968, and President Nixon officially ended it in 1971.

The economic situation we have faced since 1971 is not unique. It is all too similar to the inflations of the Revolutionary and Civil wars. During the Revolution, the Continental Congress reduced the value of its currency to a pittance. But in 1792, after the inauguration of President Washington, Congress established the gold and silver standard. During the Civil War, the U.S. government issued Greenbacks that were not convertible into gold, and the price level doubled.

Inflation was a problem until Congress began the transition to a gold standard in 1875, completing it in 1879. For more than a generation, the price level was stable, because the dollar was as good as gold.

Today, with the right leadership, our transition could be even smoother, because we know more about monetary theory, and we can learn from past mistakes.

After the disastrous paper money experiments of the Revolutionary War and Civil War periods, America rediscovered that gold

is the natural monetary standard. Gold is found in limited quantities. Its production cannot be quickly increased. It once took centuries, and even today takes a generation, to improve the technology of gold production significantly. As a result, over the long term, the gold supply increases only about two percent a year, equal to the long-term rate of economic growth in the industrialized world.

Uniquely, the decline in the real cost of producing gold over the long run is about the same as the gain in productivity. That is, the gold standard is the natural regulator of monetary growth that the monetarists seek, and fail to find, in the Federal Reserve.

Gold is also unique as a stable yardstick of economic value. It takes a relatively constant amount of capital and labor to produce an ounce of gold. So gold is the best measuring rod for the value of all other products. Over the long run, the value of gold is far more stable than any other commodity that might be used as a standard. It is certainly better than paper.

To achieve the enduring financial order that President Reagan wants, we must have the gold standard and a balanced budget. Together they establish the necessary stable legal framework, the monetary constitution for that order.

Under the gold standard, authorities must maintain the convertibility of the currency. Together with a balanced budget, this means balance in our international payments, and a much increased rate of savings by the people.

These savings under the gold standard will allow American industry once again to plan for long-range growth, knowing that it could count on permanently low interest rates for borrowing. And all this new investment would vastly increase the demand for labor.

The long night of austerity and unemployment would end. ●

ADM. FRANK HIGBEE, A
MARINER'S MARINER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, San Pedro, Calif., is honoring Adm. Frank Higbee today by naming a street for him. I'd like to add my own congratulations to Admiral Higbee and thank him for all the good things he has done for the South Bay area, the State of California, and the Nation down through the years.

Admiral Higbee has just recently celebrated his 87th birthday and his 61st wedding anniversary. In my opinion, those two accomplishments alone are sufficient to have a street named after one, but Admiral Higbee has a life history of accomplishments. The admiral is, to put it mildly, a seagoing man. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1913, rose through the ranks of warrant officer and ensign during World War I, and left the Navy in 1920, shortly after he married his wife, Joan, in Wales. Incidentally, I imagine

that the two got along well together right off the bat, as she came from a long line of English merchant mariners.

In 1921, he tried his hand at wheat farming in Oregon, but the lure of the sea proved irresistible, and in 1926, he was at sea again as a U.S. Coast Guard lieutenant in the BEAR.

Lieutenant Commander Higbee became captain of the Port of Los Angeles in 1940, a position he held during the trying years of World War II—retiring in 1946 as a captain. He was promoted to the rank of rear admiral on the retired list. But he remained active in marine affairs as port warden for the Port of Los Angeles until he retired again in 1964. He currently lends his nautical expertise to the California State Lands Commission, serving as their consultant for maritime affairs.

My wife, Lee, and I thank the admiral for his many long years of service to the country, and wish him and his wife, Joan, many more years of happiness. ●

PRO FOOTBALL AND THE L.A. COLISEUM—MORE FACTS TO REMEMBER

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law held an instructive 3-day hearing on the antitrust aspects of professional sports. Included in the subcommittee's consideration is a bill I have cosponsored, H.R. 3287, which would prohibit a sports franchise in a market in which over 2 million persons reside from arbitrarily vetoing the entry of a second franchise into that area.

The need for this legislation was dramatically demonstrated last week by professional football box office figures obtained by a reporter for the *Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise*. The data, based on a study by the National Football League's assistant treasurer's office, showed among other things that the Los Angeles Rams topped all of the other 27 franchises in net revenue from the sale of game tickets. The Rams earned a total of \$7.78 million during their first season at Anaheim Stadium, over \$1 million more than the runner-up Dallas Cowboys. Moreover, this amount must be regarded as pure profit, as it does not include each club's share of broadcasting revenues, estimated to reach \$12 to \$14 million per team under the league's next TV contract, which are thought to insure, in and of itself, the profitability of a pro football franchise.

These figures further indicate the outrageousness and indefensibility of

actions taken by the Rams' management, first in abandoning the fans and taxpayers of Los Angeles County, owners of the Los Angeles Coliseum, and then in taking steps to prevent another franchise from entering the area.

The move of the Rams to Anaheim is of course a fait accompli, but the circumstances of the case bear repeating. In leaving the Los Angeles Coliseum, their home for 34 years and the only stadium in the world to host two separate Olympic competitions, the Rams abandoned a market which was generally accepted as one of the five or six most profitable in the NFL. So it was not a case of a struggling franchise seeking to salvage its profitability. Rather, when one considers the well-publicized enticements, including land deals, dangled in front of the Rams, one can only conclude that their move to Anaheim was motivated by the single factor of greed.

But what is even more outrageous—and what must continue to concern us, as elected representatives—has been the steadfast intransigence of the Rams and the NFL in allowing a replacement franchise—by expansion or transfer—to come to the coliseum. Such opposition cannot be defended by reason or precedent, but can only be explained by the Rams' desire to retain monopoly control over what is obviously a very lucrative market.

Though the Judiciary subcommittee strove to avoid discussion of the pending litigation which seeks to effect such a transfer, the subject, as one might expect, did enter the hearing room. In view of this, it is instructive to remember that the present crisis—which has cost the coliseum commission, and in turn the taxpayers of Los Angeles County, over \$200,000 in legal expenses—was not of the county's, nor of any of the other plaintiffs' making.

In order that my colleagues and the general public might keep this in mind, I am enclosing a Los Angeles Times article, reporting on the data obtained by the *Riverside Press-Enterprise*.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 17, 1981]

NOW NFL PLAYERS HAVE THE OWNERS' NUMBERS

(By Ted Green)

When National Football League owners and players try to hash out a new collective bargaining agreement probably early next spring, the key issue in complex negotiations is really quite simple:

How big will the players' slice be from the money pie?

According to Ed Garvey, the Washington, D.C. attorney who heads the NFL Players Assn., the players' take of total team revenues is 28%.

The owners claim it is substantially higher—say, 45%.

At any rate, either figure puts NFL players in the poorhouse compared to the athletes' estimated takes in other major sports.

By most accounts, it is 48% in hockey, 50% in baseball and 60-65% in basketball.

Garvey, NFLPA executive director, says NFL players will shoot for 55% next year, or roughly twice what he says their current take is.

A 1982 strike is a real possibility. Many current contract squabbles reflect the players' near unanimous view that they are getting a raw deal.

Meanwhile, NFL players seemingly got more ammunition for their argument, with the revelation of each team's net ticket revenues last season. The figures had never before been public knowledge, and the best the players' association could do was guess.

They were uncovered by John Czarnecki, a sports writer for the *Riverside Press-Enterprise*. The figures were compiled by Tom Sullivan, the NFL's assistant treasurer. Czarnecki, protecting his sources, won't say how he discovered the document.

According to the 38-page document, which amounted to a detailed attendance and financial summary of the 1980 season, the Rams led all 28 teams with net ticket revenue of \$7,784,766 for 20 games, counting exhibitions.

It simply means that the Rams may have a healthier profit situation than any NFL team.

Thus their critics may wonder why they didn't meet the contract demands of three star players they lost this past offseason, Vince Ferragamo, Bob Brudzinski and Jack Reynolds. The Rams, free to spend (or not spend) as they please, say the demands were too steep.

Incidentally, Garvey said the Rams traditionally have been among "the top five or six" paying teams. He added that he doesn't think that has changed significantly under owner Georgia Frontiere, who inherited the club in April, 1979, after her former husband, Carrol Rosenbloom, drowned in a swimming accident.

The Dallas Cowboys were next in ticket revenues with \$6,774,925, the document said. Last were the Kansas City Chiefs at \$4,149,931. (See accompanying chart for complete list.) The range between the Rams and Chiefs was \$3.6 million.

Asked what this document might mean to the players, Garvey said:

"In every labor negotiation, one of the key elements is to have a lot of information. The more you have, the better your chance for success. Now we have a much better idea of how much the owners are actually making."

Speaking by phone from his Washington, office, Garvey said: "We say the players' current cut is 28%. The owners say 45% and shut up. We say, 'Open your books.' They say, 'Trust us.'"

"Trust me, it's about 28%."

"The bottom line is, it's an inequitable situation. The league's next TV contract will bring in between \$12 million and \$14 million a year for each team. If that's true, and if the average player salary, which was \$78,500 last year, creeps up to near \$100,000, the players' take will drop to near 20%."

So?

"So," Garvey said, "this becomes the No. 1 collective bargaining issue."

And?

"And a strike sure is possible. Obviously we don't want to strike. But we have to be prepared. We have to have the ability to shut it (pro football) down."

Garvey said the NFL's new labor negotiator, New York attorney Jack Donlon, is

eyeing next February or March as a target date to begin talks.

"I think we ought to start right now," Garvey said, "to avoid the kind of thing baseball is going through."

HOW CLUBS RANK

Team:	Net ticket revenue
1. Los Angeles.....	\$7,784,766
2. Dallas.....	6,774,925
3. Seattle.....	6,444,885
4. Tampa Bay.....	6,291,002
5. San Diego.....	6,197,078
6. New England.....	6,119,155
7. Oakland.....	5,978,503
8. Philadelphia.....	5,975,192
9. Atlanta.....	5,867,498
10. Washington.....	5,716,097
11. Cleveland.....	5,705,878
12. Buffalo.....	5,658,641
13. Detroit.....	5,525,683
14. Houston.....	5,443,542
15. Denver.....	5,436,502
16. New Orleans.....	5,396,227
17. San Francisco.....	5,320,768
18. New York Jets.....	5,248,577
19. Miami.....	5,203,739
20. New York Giants.....	5,165,546
21. Pittsburgh.....	5,128,508
22. Chicago.....	5,124,586
23. St. Louis.....	5,106,640
24. Minnesota.....	5,053,038
25. Green Bay.....	4,969,186
26. Cincinnati.....	4,365,678
27. Baltimore.....	4,319,760
28. Kansas City.....	4,149,931

IN RECOGNITION OF ALLEN PEARSON, RETIRING DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE CENTRAL REGION

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1981, Mr. Allen Pearson, Director of the National Weather Service central region retired from Federal service. I want to take this opportunity to recognize the exemplary service that he has provided to the American public. In these times, when so much attention is focused on the bad aspects of the bureaucracy, it is refreshing to work with someone who epitomizes everything that is good. Allen has been honest, forthright, creative, and dedicated to the mission of the National Weather Service.

My affiliation with Allen has been through my interest in severe storms forecasting; a field in which Allen has achieved international acclaim. Prior to becoming the Director of the National Weather Service central region, Allen was the Director of the National Severe Storms Forecast Center. During his tenure, because of the creative and innovative new techniques he introduced, major improvements were made in the quality of severe storm and tornado forecasting, thereby reducing death and injury to the

public. I can think of no better tribute to a man's dedication to his work.

In addition to being a master of the weather forecasting profession, Allen has also been an outstanding public spokesman. His ability to relate the very complex phenomena of weather has contributed immensely to the education of the public. On several occasions, I have had the distinct pleasure of having Allen appear before the Science and Technology Committee to testify on various weather issues. He has never failed to bring a vast wealth of knowledge and wisdom as well as a fresh breath of life to the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government and the American public will suffer a great loss with the retirement of Allen Pearson. But I am sure you and my colleagues will join me in wishing him the very best of luck in his new endeavors.●

COMMEMORATION OF HARRY CHAPIN'S DEDICATION TO ENDING HUNGER

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1981

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, hunger and malnutrition are two of our planet's best kept secrets, secrets that have devastating consequences. Harry Chapin was a man who was not afraid of revealing the human suffering and degradation of these secrets. He devoted a great deal of energy and gift working toward the eradication of world hunger and malnutrition and today we pay tribute to his vision.

Harry recognized what so many others have failed to: That we live in a very fragile world with limited and finite resources. He knew that only through the cooperation of the global community would all the inhabitants of our planet be fed.

We must share Harry's commitment. The monumental task of overcoming world hunger will take a concerted effort on behalf of the developing countries that suffer the most as well as by the large international community. The problem in front of us is one of making sure that the limited resources we have are put to the best possible use. We must learn to save what we do not use, and to use what we need sparingly. As a world leader, the United States must recognize its responsibility in resolving the problem of global hunger and encourage countries suffering the most, to manage food production on its own. We can do this in part through assistance programs and policies that will increase technical know-how, income, and productivity in poverty-stricken areas. But what can be just as crucial is a continuous dialog between the coun-

tries that have and those that have not. An open dialog will go just as far as economic aid, if not further, in promoting the global cooperation needed to resolve this problem.

There is no absolute solution to the world hunger problem, no magic potion that will produce nutritious, affordable food ad infinitum. But there are some practical tactics that we can take to improve the situation. The most important thing that we can do is learn to share the resources that we have.

We must understand that different countries have different needs, and that it is up to the entire industrial world—not just the United States—to help these countries meet their needs. We will all benefit in the long run if we can understand the interconnectedness of the Earth and learn to nurture its resources.

Harry understood this. We must learn a lesson from Harry Chapin's life and pursue his dream. I grieve at his death but I celebrate his life.●

H.R. 4083—CONTROVERSIAL BILL

HON. GENE CHAPPIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. CHAPPIE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon, July 17, this body passed a controversial bill by unanimous consent, with no more than a handful of Members present. The bill, H.R. 4083, sets aside more than 2 million acres of California national forest land as wilderness preserves. The bill's sponsor was my colleague from California, PHILLIP BURTON.

The entire process of handling this legislation—in subcommittee, full committee, and in bringing it to the House floor—involved, to my way of thinking, highly unusual tactics.

H.R. 4083 had been scheduled to come before the House on Monday, July 20, under suspension of the rules. I was prepared to object on the floor because the bill is highly controversial and will have an enormous impact in my district, as well as in other areas of California and southern Oregon. Perhaps advocates of the bill anticipated opposition, and were prompted to steamroll the bill through late Friday under consent procedures.

The upshot is, the House has made this bill appear noncontroversial by approving it under unanimous consent. In committee, H.R. 4083 was opposed by the administration. There was no agreement among the California delegation to consent consideration, since others also had serious objections to the bill. The word that seemed to go out was that the minority Members of the California delegation, whose districts are most affected

by H.R. 4083, had signed off on the bill. This was certainly not the case.

This wilderness proposal was highly controversial in this, and the last, Congress. There are widely divergent views as to what constitutes the most acceptable acreage for wilderness preservation and what lands should be open for multiple-use management. By a single action, H.R. 4083 would double existing California wilderness by adding more than 2.1 million acres from the State's national forest lands to the wilderness system.

Under the Carter administration, the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II) recommended 1.3 million acres for wilderness in California. The Reagan administration, however, favors California RARE II wilderness additions of 1.2 million acres, which are also endorsed by the forestry professionals at the U.S. Forest Service. Objections to the wilderness acreage in the Burton proposal have been raised by many groups, among them recreation, timber, mining, ranchers, farmers, labor, homebuilders, and county officials. The people in California who depend on access to these resource-rich lands for jobs and recreation are concerned that they and their interests are being locked out.

At hearings last May in Weaverville, Calif., all attendance records were broken. Views expressed at the Weaverville hearings were highly charged, both for and against the Burton proposal, as were the views expressed in this body over the last 2 years. Yet, no one would have guessed it, in light of the way H.R. 4083 virtually flew off the House floor.

One of the mainstays of northern California is the forest products industry. H.R. 4083 would substantially reduce the volume of national forest timber available to mills in northern California. Such reductions will critically affect the economies of scores of communities where the timber industry is the major economic activity.

The bill would also substantially reduce the number and quality of services many northern California counties now fund from national forest timber sale receipts. And, of course, designations as wilderness impose severe restraints on geological exploration for mineral and energy resource development.

Yet, in a matter of 4 days, this bill sailed through subcommittee, full committee, and was passed by the House. This is incredible to me. Certainly my constituents will be appalled that, with 900,000 acres of wilderness proposed in my district, their concerns were not represented due to the legislative maneuverings of this Chamber.

The manner in which this bill was reported from the House Interior Committee was very clever. Under Mr. BURTON's leadership, the committee

reported two almost identical bills, H.R. 4083 and H.R. 4043, but filed a report on only one, H.R. 4083. The strategy, I suspect, was to either circumvent, or permit only minimal attention by, the House Agriculture Committee on which I serve. On the floor, Mr. BURTON then added an amendment from H.R. 4043 providing only short-term release for lands determined best suited for nonwilderness use. This amendment was the only difference between the two Burton bills reported by the Interior Committee.

I think the minority leadership should be aware of the short shrift certain minority Members of the California delegation received throughout this entire process. I sincerely hope that the Senate will see through the events of July 17 and give every aspect of this legislation the careful consideration it deserves.●

OLIVER VICKERY: SOUTH BAY HISTORIAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to discuss one of my longtime friends, Oliver Vickery. San Pedro, Calif., is naming a street in honor of Mr. Vickery today, and I want to add my own personal congratulations and thanks to him.

Mr. Vickery was born in Kentucky, but headed west to attend and graduate from the University of California. After his schooling, Oliver entered the marine supply business in San Pedro. He was a stalwart member of the business community for many years, but he is remembered for much more than his business successes. He is one of the South Bay's leading historians and has, over the years, devoted countless hours to preserving for future generations the history, lore, and artifacts of the area's past. He served as the curator of the Banning Mansion for a long period of time, and is remembered for his many excellent articles on Phineas Banning, a pioneer in southern California's early history. He has also authored a book about the harbor area entitled "Harbor Heritage," and is a regular contributor to the News Pilot, our local daily newspaper.

I, for one, will never forget Mr. Vickery's trip to the Soviet Union during the 1950's, at the height of the cold war, when he courageously espoused the cause of capitalism and free enterprise to what was perhaps not the most receptive of audiences. A national magazine did a feature story on his trip to Russia and his stunning comments.

My wife, Lee, and I want Oliver Vickery to know how much we, and all

the people of San Pedro, appreciate his good work through the years, and we wish him many more years in the future so that we may all benefit from his continuing efforts on behalf of his community.●

CONGRESSIONAL TEXTILE CAUCUS FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL TEXTILE CAUCUS QUARTERLY STATEMENT OF EXPENSES AND FUND BALANCE

HON. KEN HOLLAND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the chairman, vice chairman, and secretary-treasurer of the Congressional Textile Caucus have approved the quarterly financial statement for the quarter ending June 30, 1981. I am herewith submitting the statement for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may review it.

The statement follows:

CONGRESSIONAL TEXTILE CAUCUS FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL TEXTILE CAUCUS QUARTERLY STATEMENT OF EXPENSES AND FUND BALANCE

[For the period ending June 30, 1981]

Expenditures:	
Telephone.....	\$81.39
Do.....	90.96
Do.....	94.90
Office supplies.....	181.55
Do.....	121.32
Do.....	20.00
Do.....	23.68
Typewriter.....	684.40
Do.....	174.00
Copy machine.....	135.00
Do.....	135.00
Postage.....	3.00
Do.....	18.00
Subscriptions.....	25.50
Do.....	12.40
Total expenditures.....	1,801.10
Fund balance:	
Fund balance Mar. 31, 1981.....	8,641.60
Total dues deposited this quarter.....	6,800.00
Interest on account.....	133.26
Total.....	15,574.86
Less expenditures.....	1,801.10
Balance—June 30, 1981.....	13,773.76

GREAT LAKES DILEMMA

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes once supported major and valuable renewable fishery resources. However, the decline of these resources in this century has been dra-

matic and well documented. At the turn of the century, Great Lakes commercial fishermen landed about 110 million pounds of fish per year; by 1975, landings had dropped to 61 million pounds per year. In the 1940's and 1950's lake trout, a major game fish, virtually disappeared from many areas of the Great Lakes, and these fish populations have never recovered. The contributing causes to the decline of the Great Lakes fisheries include habitat alterations, changes in forage fish supply, deterioration of water quality, the invasion of the parasitic sea lamprey, and overfishing.

Great strides have been made in the improvement of fishery management, particularly the eradication of the parasitic sea lamprey, which has appreciably restored fish populations. Advances in cleaning up the Great Lakes significantly improved fishery resource habitats.

However, overfishing in the Great Lakes now poses an ominous threat to the future survivability of fish species. A longstanding conflict between the State of Michigan, which contends it has the right to manage fish species for conservation purposes, and Indian fishermen, who feel, by virtue of their treaty rights, they should be unencumbered in their right, manner, and place of harvesting fish species, has been resolved in favor of the Indians by the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

On this issue, I insert for the RECORD a July 21 editorial in the Detroit News, which presents a number of options which must be carefully considered in order to resolve this resource crisis. These options should be taken seriously and with great haste if we are to save the fishery resources in our Great Lakes:

A THREATENED FISHERY

The Indians won and Michigan lost when the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati upheld Federal Judge Noel Fox's ruling that states have no right to regulate Indian fishing.

The decision, if it stands, is the death knell for sport fishing in the Great Lakes, and the perpetuation of an injustice done to all sport fishermen.

At the core of the argument are two ancient treaties which conveyed rights to Indians in northern Michigan. The "treaty waters" are in Lake Michigan, north of Grand Haven and Lake Huron north of South Point, and in Lake Superior's Whitefish Bay.

Overfishing, plus the infestations of lamprey eels and the alewife trash fish, all but destroyed the whitefish and lake trout populations of lakes Michigan and Huron two decades ago. There weren't enough fish in them to argue over.

Since then, Michigan has operated a remarkable restocking program, financed with the license fees of sport fishermen. The lamprey eel was controlled. Two species of salmon were established and they gorged themselves on alewives. Further, plantings of lake trout thrived and grew to boasting size.

Indians vacuumed White Fish Bay with gill nets, which are illegal under state law. Having no fish near their reservations, they moved south to lakes Huron and Michigan and began an assault that alarmed and angered sport fishermen.

Gill nets ensnare all fish that swim into their coarse mesh, where they suffocate as their gills become tangled. Indians who net commercial whitefish also kill lake trout and salmon.

When the treaties were written in the 1800s, Indians fished for their own needs and put little pressure on the resource. Today, with whitefish going for more than \$4 a pound, Indians or those who claim falsely to be members of a tribe, take every fish they can find.

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) monitored Indian fishing in Grand Traverse Bay in 1980, and said gill-netting took 350,000 pounds of lake trout and 70,000 pounds of whitefish in two months.

No fishery can withstand such pressure for long.

Further, profligate harvesting of lake trout is occurring at the very point in the program when lake trout populations are becoming large enough to reproduce naturally.

What's to be done?

First, because the resource is so important in terms of food and tourist dollars, the state is obliged to appeal the judgment to the U.S. Supreme Court. Every legal recourse must be exhausted.

Second, it would be wasteful to spend additional dollars stocking lake trout in the disputed waters. Since the fish hatcheries are financed with anglers' fees, the fingerlings should go to waters that are controlled and where there is some hope of achieving natural regeneration.

Third, since salmon are more migratory than lake trout, there should be a slowdown in the salmon planting program.

If the state loses in the U.S. Supreme Court, the next step must be negotiation with the tribes. The DNR must make it clear that there will be no plantings unless the Indians accept—indeed, help write—rules that will control fishing pressures so the resource will be maintained perpetually.

There are sensible ways to develop Indian commercial fishing. Pound nets trap fish but don't kill them. When they are used, game fish can be returned to the water alive when the whitefish are harvested.

Once that's accomplished, the DNR can get back to the business of restoring the fishery in the "treaty waters," a feat that we know is scientifically possible.

Should this effort fail, Congress must then deal with the issue. The state, indeed the country, can't accept treaties, laws, or interpretations of either that condemn lakes Michigan and Huron to sterility.●

TO INCREASE ALTERNATIVES TO INSTITUTIONALIZATION

HON. MILLCENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, over 1 million elderly Americans—5 percent of those who are over 65 years of age—live in nursing homes, and many of them will spend the rest of their lives

there, isolated from family and from friends. Although many of these people need the nursing care which can be provided only by an institution, a 1977 Congressional Budget Office study estimated that 20 to 40 percent of them could be cared for at home if help were available. In this Congress I have, again, introduced a proposal to provide an alternative to institutionalization for these people—an alternative that could save a good deal of money.

Existing health programs for the aged have a strong institutional bias. Medicaid supports the vast bulk of federally subsidized long-term care, \$20.7 billion was the 1979 Federal and State total for Medicaid, \$8.8 billion of this was for nursing home care alone, and only \$264 million for home health care. Part of the problem is that eligibility for Medicaid is determined more by income than by medical need. For example, in New Jersey, one's income cannot exceed \$261 per month in order to qualify for home health care, yet for nursing home care one's monthly income may be as high as \$716. Under present Medicare law, the institutional bias continues; home health visits are limited and not designed for long-term needs.

If some of the money currently used for institutional care could be made available to those individuals or to their families, many could avoid institutionalization altogether. We now have between 260,000 and 520,000 elderly people sustained in nursing homes at high expense, despite the fact that they could be cared for at home for little more than half of the cost and—even more importantly—at far greater happiness and comfort. The Government should be encouraging family unity rather than discouraging it.

My bill would provide the groundwork for alternatives to institutionalization by authorizing demonstration projects wherein those people eligible for tax-paid nursing home care would be paid a tax-free stipend equal to 50 percent of the average nursing home cost. This stipend could finance care in a home situation which would suit their needs—with their family, or a foster family, or with friends in a co-operative living arrangement, pooling their resources. The living situation would be reviewed periodically by a competent health official to determine whether the stipend was being used properly, to the person's satisfaction and happiness.

A somewhat similar project is in progress in Maryland on a small scale. The study involves two groups; in one, the elderly person's family was given a stipend of up to \$2,000 per year to help with the cost of health supplies, housing, food, and other necessities. Health care is paid for separately, in

addition to the stipend. The other group received no subsidy of any kind. The preliminary report indicates that without a stipend, only minimal support is available to families who provide care for an elderly relative. Because of the heavy drain on financial and emotional resources, even the most loving and caring family will admit their elderly parent into a nursing home, where public support is finally available. On the other hand, it appears that the stipend, although small, was enough of a help to enable the elderly person to remain at home.

I have introduced H.R. 2833 with the expectation that although saving a considerable amount of money, it can provide independence and dignity for a great number of elderly people in this country. Separation from one's family ought not to be required or encouraged by government regulations and incentives. Institutionalization ought, rather, to be an option of last resort.

For the RECORD, a complete text of the bill follows:

H.R. 2833

A bill to provide alternatives to institutionalization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may provide, through demonstration projects payments to individuals who are receiving, or are eligible to receive, benefits with respect to post-hospital extended care services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act or intermediate care facility services or skilled nursing facility services under title XIX of such Act, who do not require twenty-four hour nursing care or supervision, and who desire to establish a noninstitutional living arrangement which will meet their medical and other needs.

(b) The amount of any payment made to any individual under this Act shall be an amount determined by multiplying—

(1) the number of days in the period for which the payment is made, by

(2) 50 per centum of the average daily benefit paid for the services described in subsection (a), in the State in which such individual resides, on behalf of an individual under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act.

(c) Any payment received by an individual under this Act shall be used for the purpose of financing an appropriate noninstitutional living arrangement which meets the medical and other needs of the individual. The Secretary shall provide that such living arrangement will be reviewed periodically by a registered nurse or other appropriate health official for the purpose of determining whether the individual is satisfied with the care as a result of such arrangement.

(d) Any payment made under this Act shall be made on such terms and conditions, in advance or by reimbursement, in such installments, and for such length of time as the Secretary determines will best meet the medical and other needs of the individual receiving the payments.

(e) Such payments shall not be includable in gross income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(f)(1) The Secretary shall design demonstration projects established under this Act for the purpose of determining—

(A) the economic, medical, psychological, and sociological feasibility of transferring inpatients of skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities to noninstitutional living arrangements;

(B) the types and percentage of such inpatients who could live effectively in a noninstitutional living arrangement; and

(C) the types and percentages of such inpatients who would benefit economically and qualitatively from transferring to a noninstitutional living arrangement.

(2) The Secretary shall, within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, transmit a report to each House of the Congress concerning the findings and conclusions which have been made with respect to the matters described in paragraph (1). In addition, such report shall contain recommendations, if any, by the Secretary for legislative action with respect to such matters.

(g) Funds made available under this Act shall be made in appropriate part, as determined by the Secretary, from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (established by section 1817 of the Social Security Act) and from funds appropriated to carry out title XIX of the Social Security Act.●

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRITCHARD-EDGAR AMENDMENT ON THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY PROJECT

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, there are six good reasons to support the Pritchard-Edgar amendment on the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway project.

First, the vast majority of the project has been halted by the fifth circuit court of appeals.

Second, the project will cost another \$2 billion to complete—\$200 million a year for the next 10 years.

Third, in March 1981, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee voted 9 to 5 to recommend termination of the project.

Fourth, the project is only 33 percent complete, and will be a dismal economic failure even if finished because it will move negligible amounts of coal or other traffic.

Fifth, as stated in the July 22, 1981, New York Times editorial:

The economic case against both projects was forcefully stated by President Reagan's own Budget Director, David Stockman, while he was still a Congressman. . . . He suggested that if Congress paid for marginal enterprises like Tenn-Tom, it ought to "go whole hog and build a pyramid in every State."

Sixth, as stated in the July 22, 1981, Philadelphia Inquirer editorial:

The court enjoined further construction of a major portion of the waterway, ruling that The Corps had "blatantly" violated Federal environmental requirements and intentionally used outdated financial statistics

to make the project appear economically viable.

Both editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1981]

DISPENSABLE PORK

After cutting funds for food stamps, youth employment, Medicaid and a host of other social programs, the Reagan Administration endorsed two highly questionable multibillion-dollar construction projects of particular interest to powerful legislators—the Clinch River breeder reactor and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

This week the House has a chance to derail both of them. It should. An Administration and Congress asking everyone to make do with less have no right to cling to such blatant pork barrels.

The Clinch River breeder reactor, which is to be built in Tennessee, is championed by that state's Senator Baker, the majority leader. It is supposed to demonstrate the breeder's potential for using nuclear fuel more efficiently than conventional reactors. But this \$3.2 billion project is apt to wind up a technological turkey. Some consider the relatively small reactor obsolete; it might also fall short of Federal safety and environmental requirements. A House subcommittee staff recently concluded that projected costs are soaring because of lax management. And the need for even a well-conceived breeder is diminishing as demand for electricity falls and estimates of uranium supplies rise.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, in Mississippi and Alabama, would link the Tennessee River with an existing waterway that leads south to the Gulf of Mexico. It has powerful supporters on the Appropriations Committee in two Mississippians, Jamie Whitten and Tom Bevill. About \$1.1 billion has already been spent on construction over the last decade, more than half the total estimated cost.

Even so, there may be good reason to halt the project. Tenn-Tom will create a bottleneck on the waterway to the south, and easing that problem would cost another \$1 billion. Moreover, both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service question predictions that enough barge traffic will materialize to justify the linkup.

The economic case against both projects was forcefully stated by President Reagan's own budget director, David Stockman, while he was still a Congressman. Financing Clinch River, he warned, would encourage "a never-ending stream of outstretched palms" for Federal subsidies. He suggested that if Congress paid for marginal enterprises like Tenn-Tom, it ought to "go whole hog and build a pyramid in every state." The House should give both projects a pharaoh's burial.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 22, 1981]

SAYING NO TO PORK-BARRELISM

This week the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to commit the federal government to pay for a \$3 billion water project and a \$3.2 billion breeder reactor. For that \$6.2 billion, the American taxpayer will receive a 232-mile waterway which has almost no economic justification and an energy project that, when completed, probably will be mothballed because it is useless.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and the Clinch River Breeder Reactor represent

pork-barrell politics at their most outrageous. They have survived close votes in Congress in past years, because they are favorites of a powerful group of Southern members of Congress. This year, which has brought drastic reductions in social and economic programs vital to millions of Americans, the House must put cronyism aside and reject more money for the two projects.

House members will be asked to approve fiscal year 1982 appropriations of \$189 million for Tenn-Tom and \$250 million for Clinch River. That money will go toward projects that can make the following claims:

Clinch River. The cost overruns for the Breeder reactor already amount to 450 percent, making it the most expensive power project ever. A House oversight and investigations subcommittee has labeled the project a management fiasco marked by "unbelievably loose," unenforceable contracts. The plant may produce electricity by 1990, 11 years behind schedule at a cost so high that the government will have to sell it at a loss, or shut down the plant. When the Carter administration tried to kill the Clinch River project, it won an ally in the Congress. David A. Stockman, who maintained that "no further subsidization of the Clinch River program . . . can be justified." Mr. Stockman, now President Reagan's budget director, has backed away from that position in light of the administration's support for Clinch River.

Tenn-Tom. Known as the "clone of the Mississippi River," the Tenn-Tom waterway will link the Tennessee River with the Gulf of Mexico. The General Accounting Office and the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals recently challenged the data used by the Army Corps of Engineers to justify construction of the largest public works project currently under way in the United States. The court enjoined further construction of a major portion of the waterway, ruling that the corps had "blatantly" violated federal environmental requirements and intentionally used out-dated financial statistics to make the project appear economically viable.

Rep. Robert W. Edgar (D., Pa.) long has led the fight in the House against funding Tenn-Tom, claiming that the amount earmarked to complete the waterway is more than double the federal funds allocated for all public works projects in Northeastern states. He and Rep. Joel Pritchard (R., Wash.) last year came close to winning that fight in Congress, and will mount a spirited effort again this year. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor vote also will be close.

The House has busied itself during the budget process in ferreting out waste and excess in a wide range of federal programs. It cannot allow the appropriations for two of the most wasteful and excessive to be approved.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when sched-

uled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 23, 1981, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 24

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

Closed business meeting, to mark up S. 846, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for national security programs of the Department of Energy, and to consider pending routine military nominations.

212 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of James C. Miller III, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

235 Russell Building

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax proposals, including S. 805, S. 1214, S. 1304, S. 1320, S. 1369, and S. 531.

2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To resume hearings on arms control issues.

212 Russell Building

Conferees

Senate Committee on Small Business conferees and House Committee on Small Business conferees on the Small Business Administration provisions of H.R. 3982, providing for reconciliation pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 115, the First Concurrent Resolution of the Congressional Budget.

Room S-146, Capitol

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of Anthony G. Sousa, of Hawaii, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, J. Robinson West, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Interior for Policy, Budget and Administration, Jan W. Mares, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy, and Alvin W. Trivelpiece, of California, to be director of the Office of Energy Research, Department of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

*Water Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1493, deauthorizing certain water resources projects within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and on other related issues.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on S. 854, establishing an Office of Foreign Missions responsible for providing benefits for foreign missions on terms approved by the Secretary of State.

4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To continue hearings on monopolization and competition in the telecommunications industry.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting, to further discuss S. 1088, promoting the goal of economic and social self-sufficiency for American Indians, Hawaiian Natives, and Alaskan Natives, and to discuss a proposed committee report on the adequacy of Federal supervision and monitoring of oil theft on Indian and Federal lease lands.

1224 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the enforcement of U.S. immigration laws.

412 Russell Building

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation extending the President's authority to waive the freedom of immigration provision of the Trade Act.

2221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on research activities of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Research and General Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed revisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), Public Law 96-539.

324 Russell Building

*Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Jose M. Casanova, of Florida, to be Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, and Abraham Katz, of Florida, to be the Representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 678, expanding the present ZIP code system to a 9-digit ZIP code, and S. 1080, improving and modifying the Federal regulatory process.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed revisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), Public Law 96-539.

324 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Frederick L. Chapin, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to Guatemala.

4221 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To receive testimony from Assistant Secretary of Defense-Designate Richard N. Perle on international security policy issues.

4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 28

9:00 a.m.

*Select on Ethics

To resume hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to provide title to contractors receiving Federal research and development funds.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 708, clarifying the intent and modifying certain provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, and S. 868, directing the Export-Import Bank to adopt export finance programs comparable in structure to those measures of official export credits offered by competing countries.

5302 Dirksen Building

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To resume hearings on U.S. trade policy.

2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 1503, authorizing the President to allocate supplies of crude oil and petroleum products during a severe petroleum supply shortage, S. 1476, S. 1354, and S. 409, bills providing standby authority to deal with petroleum supply disruptions, and S. 445, establishing a State set-aside system for propane, middle distillates, motor gasoline, residual fuel oil, and aviation fuels.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

*Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To discuss alternatives for delivering public services, focusing on certain private sector involvement in social services.

Room to be announced

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 29

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue discussion of alternatives for delivering public services, focusing on certain private sector involvement in social services.

357 Russell Building

*Labor and Human Resources

To resume oversight hearings on the activities of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor, focusing on Executive Order 11246, regulations relating to affirmative action.

4232 Dirksen Building

*Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting, to continue mark up of S. 708, clarifying the intent and modifying certain provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, and S. 868, directing the Export-Import Bank to adopt export finance programs comparable in structure to those measures of official export credits offered by competing countries.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

*Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Copyright Act of 1976, focusing on section 101 relative to cable TV policy.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 792, establishing a National Institute of Native American Culture and Arts Development.

5110 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To resume hearings on monopolization and competition in the telecommunications industry.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue discussion of alternatives for delivering public services, focusing on certain private sector involvement in social services.

357 Russell Building

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging

To hold hearings on proposals relating to medicare reimbursement to competitive medical plans.

5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 30

9:00 a.m.

*Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue discussion of alternatives for delivering public services, focusing on certain private sector involvement in social services.

318 Russell Building

*Labor and Human Resources

To continue oversight hearings on the activities of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the Department of Labor, focusing on Executive Order 11246, regulations relating to affirmative action.

4232 Dirksen Building

*Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on S. 1503, authorizing the President to allocate supplies of crude oil and petroleum products during a severe petroleum supply shortage, S. 1476, S. 1354, and S. 409, bills providing standby authority to deal with petroleum supply disruptions, and S. 445, establishing a State set-aside system for propane, middle distillates, motor gasoline, residual fuel oil, and aviation fuels.

3110 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 159, authorizing the exchange of certain land held by the Navajo Tribe and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, and S. 1340, providing for the use and distribution of judgment funds awarded to the Clallam Tribe of Indians, State of Washington.

3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 326, prohibiting a refiner, other than an independent or small refiner, from operating a gas station in the United States, and making it unlawful for a supplier to practice price discrimination in the sale of motor fuel.

2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law of the Judiciary to examine the administration's policy relative to immigration and refugees.

412 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Armed Services

To meet in closed session to discuss the role of military power in foreign policy

objectives and specific foreign policy initiatives of the administration.

212 Russell Building

JULY 31

9:00 a.m.

*Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act, and on S. 1247, S. 1235, and S. 587, bills providing for the protection of certain confidential information from the disclosure requirements of the Freedom of Information Act.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on employer sanctions.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 24

9:30 a.m.

Select on Ethics

Closed meeting, to discuss committee procedures in its investigation of Senator Williams.

6228 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 10

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 41, proposed constitutional amendment prohibiting the United States or any State from making or enforcing any law which makes distinctions on account of race, color, or national origin.

2228 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 15

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on primary intervention in addressing societal problems.

4232 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 16

9:30 a.m.

*Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to markup S. 5, S. 7, S. 25, S. 26, S. 48, S. 105, S. 248, S. 417, and S. 742, bills providing educational assistance to members of the Armed Forces, and S. 266 and amendment No. 62 of S. 636 (Veterans' Administration Health Care Amendments), measures implementing procedures and guidelines for the interagency sharing of health resources between the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration.

412 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 22

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on fiscal year 1982 legislative recommendations of the American Legion.

318 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 23

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Investigations and General Oversight Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

4232 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 24

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Investigations and General Oversight Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the activities of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

4232 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 30

9:30 a.m.

*Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to markup S. 349, providing for limited judicial review of the administrative action of the Veterans' Administration, and for reasonable fees to attorneys representing legal counsel for veterans.

412 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 23

9:30 a.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Federal coal leasing program.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 24

9:30 a.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Select on Ethics

To continue hearings on matters involving Senator Williams.

6226 Dirksen Building